Liturgy in Early Christian Egypt



Gorgias Liturgical Studies

33

This series is intended to provide a venue for studies about liturgies as well as books containing various liturgies. Making liturgical studies available to those who wish to learn more about their own worship and practice or about the traditions of other religious groups, this series includes works on service music, the daily offices, services for special occasions, and the sacraments.

Liturgy in Early Christian Egypt

Maxwell Johnson



gorgias press

2010

Gorgias Press LLC, 180 Centennial Ave., Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Originally published in

2010 



ISBN 978-1-60724-384-7 ISSN 1937-3252

Published first in the U.K. by Grove Books, 1995.

Printed in the United States of America

Liturgy in Early Christian Egypt

by Maxwell E. Johnson

Assistant Professor of Liturgy, School and Department of Theology
Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota, USA

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AC *Apostolic Constitutions*
AT *Apostolic Tradition*
ACC Alcuin Club Collections
AGLS Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study
ANF *Ante-Nicene Fathers*
BEW R. Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding* (The Pastoral Press, Washington D.C., 1984)
CH *Canons of Hippolytus*
GCS *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*
GLS Grove Liturgical Study
HE *Historia ecclesiastica*
LEW F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. Vol. 1: *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, 1896)
LWSS M. E. Johnson, *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation* (The Liturgical Press, Pueblo, Collegeville, MN, 1995)
MC Mystagogical Catecheses
NPNF *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*
OCA *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*
OCP *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
PEER R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming (eds.), *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Pueblo Books, New York, 1987)
PG J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*
PO *Patrologia Orientalis*
SAR The Prayer Collection ascribed to Sarapion of Thmuis
SC Sources Chrétiennes
TD *Testamentum Domini*
TS *Theological Studies*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the following for their assistance with this work: Professor Robert Taft, S.J., of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, Italy, and editor of OCA, for his permission to use and cite from my study, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis* (OCA 249, Rome, 1995); Professor Paul Bradshaw of the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA, Professor John Klentos, my departmental colleague, and Rhoda Schuler, my former graduate student, for their reading of either all or portions of the manuscript and for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Introduction

The last twenty years of liturgical scholarship on early Christian worship reveal a decisive 'Exodus' in reverse. Scholars have returned increasingly to Egypt, where the origins and development of the Egyptian or Alexandrian Christian liturgical tradition, and its occasional wider influence in the liturgical life of the early Church, have received renewed focus and emphasis. Egyptian liturgical sources have been freshly edited, translated, and re-visited with new critical eyes, and traditional assumptions about their dates, role, and overall significance have been challenged[1]. Especially among liturgical scholars in the English-speaking world, this renewed emphasis has been concerned primarily with the rites of Christian initiation[2], with the eucharistic liturgy and anaphoral construction[3], and with the evolution of the liturgical year.[4]

What this recent scholarship has tended to reveal for early Christian Egypt is an indigenous liturgical tradition which often defies categorization as anything other than 'Alexandrian' or 'Egyptian'. Although some similarities and parallels do of course exist between this tradition and those generally termed 'Eastern' or 'Western', Egyptian liturgy, with its own unique structures and theologies, merits separate attention as an important witness to what is increasingly being viewed as the rich diversity and pluriform nature of early Christian liturgical life and theology in general.[5]

This brief study investigates the Egyptian liturgical tradition up to the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) primarily by summarizing and critically evaluating the contributions of recent scholarship on a variety of topics. Written as an introductory text for students of liturgy, the three short chapters on the rites of Christian initiation, on the eucharistic liturgy and its anaphora, and on orders, hours, and the liturgical year, seek to provide only the current state of the question with regard to these issues. This study, in other words, is an attempt to answer the question, 'What are contemporary liturgical scholars saying about Egyptian liturgy?' And in this way it is hoped that what John Baldovin's *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*[6] has done for the introductory study of fourth-century Hagiopolite liturgy this short work will do for the Egyptian tradition within the same historical context.

---

[1] See Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Canons of Hippolytus*, hereafter, *Canons*, (AGLS 2, Grove Books, Nottingham, 1987); R. J. S. Barrett-Lennard, *The Sacramentary of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Text for Students*, hereafter, *Sacramentary*, (AGLS 25, Grove Books, Nottingham, 1993); and my study, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis* (OCA, 249 Rome, 1995) hereafter, *Prayers*.

[2] See Paul F. Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice in the Alexandrian Tradition, Eastern or Western?' (hereafter, 'Baptismal Practice') in *Idem*. (ed.), *Essays in Early Eastern Initiation* (AGLS 8, Grove Books, Nottingham, 1988), pp.5-17 (Reprinted in LWSS, pp.82-100).

[3] See Geoffrey J. Cuming, *The Liturgy of St Mark*, hereafter, *St Mark*, (OCA 234, Rome, 1990); John R. K. Fenwick, *Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques* (GLS 45, Grove Books, Nottingham, 1986); and *The Anaphoras of St Basil and St James: An Investigation into their Common Origins* , hereafter, *Basil and James*, (OCA 240, Rome, 1992).

[4] See Thomas J. Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* (hereafter, *Year*) Second, Emended Edition (Pueblo, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1991).

[5] For recent works on early Egyptian Christianity in general see B.A. Pearson and J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1986); C.W. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity: From its Origins to 451 C.E.*, hereafter, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, (E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1990); and C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* , hereafter, *Manuscript*, (London, 1979).

[6] (AGLS 9, Grove Books, Nottingham, 1989).

Before beginning this study, however, a word of caution is in order. One of the major problems in the study of early Egyptian liturgy, with the notable exception of numerous anaphoral texts and fragments, is both the paucity of Egyptian *liturgical* sources and the nature of those sources that we do possess. No fourth-century bishop within the Egyptian tradition, for example, ever produced, as far as we know, a collection of pre-baptismal or mystagogical catechetical lectures akin to those of Cyril (or John) of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, or Ambrose of Milan, which could have given us a reliable depiction of Egyptian liturgical practice in that same period. The fourth-century Spanish pilgrim Egeria, of course, did visit both Lower and Upper Egypt in her travels, but she tells us almost nothing about Egyptian liturgical practice in this context. And while the *Institutes* of John Cassian do reveal some things about the shape of the Egyptian *monastic* liturgy of the hours in the late fourth century, his witness tends to be limited to monastic circles and, given his own agenda of monastic reform in Gaul, needs to be used with some degree of caution. Therefore, apart from occasional liturgical references scattered throughout the writings of various patristic authors (e.g., Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, and Cyril of Alexandria) and the anaphoral sources noted above, the principal Egyptian liturgical documents are CH and the sacramentary, euchologion, *libellus*, or prayer collection known as SAR (*c.* 350).

The first of these, however, is derived to a large degree from the so-called AT, ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome (ca. 215), and belongs to that genre of literature known as a 'church order', a type of document which just as often can be prescribing what liturgical practice *should* be as it is in describing what that practice actually is.[1] And regarding the second there has been a long scholarly debate on whether it is a reliable indicator of mid-fourth century orthodox liturgy and theology preserving earlier traditions of Egyptian euchology or if it should be viewed as a mid-fifth century and deliberately heretical text.[2] What this means, of course, is that conclusions regarding the earlier shape of Egyptian liturgy must often depend on pieces of evidence, hints, and suggestions appearing only in later sources from which reasonable conjectures and possible reconstructions might be made. Robert Taft has said on more than one occasion that the study of early liturgy is similar to attempting to put together a jigsaw puzzle without having all the pieces. Nowhere is that more true than in studying the early Egyptian liturgical tradition.

[1] On 'church orders' see Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* , hereafter, *Search*, (Oxford University Press, New York/London, 1992), pp.80-110.

[2] In addition to the references to SAR on p.5, note 1, above see also, B. Botte, 'L'Eucologe de Sérapion est-il authentique?' in *Oriens Christianus* 48 (1964), pp.50-56; B. Capelle, 'L'Anaphore de Sérapion. Essai d'exégèse', in *Le Muséon* 59 (1946), pp.425-443; G.J. Cuming, 'Thmuis Revisited: Another Look at the Prayers of Bishop Sarapion' (hereafter 'Thmuis Revisited') in TS 41 (1980), pp.568-575; M.E. Johnson, 'A Fresh Look at the Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis' (hereafter 'A Fresh Look') in *Studia Liturgica* 22 (1992), pp.163-183; and *Idem.*, 'The Archaic Nature of the Sanctus, Institution Narrative, and Epiclesis of the Logos in the Anaphora Ascribed to Sarapion of Thmuis', forthcoming in a collection of essays from the 75th Anniversary International Scholarly Congress at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, 1993 (from OCA).

1. Christian Initiation

Contemporary scholarship on the rites of Christian initiation in the Egyptian tradition, represented especially by the work of Georg Kretschmar[1] and Paul Bradshaw[2], suggests strongly that early Egyptian initiatory practice consisted of: (1) a catechumenate of forty days in duration with a single final scrutiny and with no exorcism implied; (2) a non-exorcistic pre-baptismal anointing, to which great importance was attached; (3) a renunciation and syntaxis; (4) baptism proper; and (5) the celebration of the eucharist[3]. In addition to these elements, the recent work of Thomas Talley on the origins of the liturgical year has underscored for Egyptian initiation the central role of Epiphany as the celebration of the baptism of Jesus[4] and its concomitant theology of new birth and adoption, rather than the paschal focus of initiation as participation in the death and burial of Christ along the lines of Romans 6.

THE DAY FOR BAPTISM AND THE CATECHUMENATE

That some kind of Epiphany or Jordan-event context surrounded the early Egyptian rites of initiation seems to be indicated from the writings of both Clement of Alexandria (c. A.D. 150-215) and Origen (c. A.D. 185-253). Not only is Clement an early witness to some form of Alexandrian celebration of January 6 as a festival of the baptism of Jesus[5], a claim further supported by the fourth-century *Canons of Athanasius*[6], but he also interprets Christian baptism itself according to the Old Testament typology of the Israelites crossing the Jordan river under Joshua.[7] And, although Origen is one of the first patristic writers to treat the theology of Romans 6 in relationship to Christian baptism[8], his primary interpretive or typological model, like that of his teacher Clement, is also this crossing of the Jordan. Indeed, Origen speaks of two water 'crossings': the crossing of the Red Sea, interpreted as the escape from the 'Egypt of shame' and entrance into the *catechumenate*, and the crossing of the Jordan under Joshua-Jesus as baptismal assimilation to the mystery of Christ.[9] Similarly, SAR 7, 'Sanctification of Waters', in its possibly archaic invocation of

---

[1] 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie, insbesondere der Taufliturgie, in Aegypten' (hereafter, *Beiträge*) in *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 8 (1963), pp. 1-54.

[2] Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice,' pp.5-17.

[3] Since the eucharistic liturgy and the anaphora are the subjects of the following chapter, they will not be discussed here.

[4] See above, p.5, note 4.

[5] *Stromateis* I.21.

[6] W. Riedel and W. Crum (eds.), *The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria* (London, 1904), pp. 26-27.[9] *Stromata* II. 18.

[7] *Eclogae propheticae* 5-6.

[8] Cf. *Contra Celsum* 2.69, *Com. in Ev. Joan.* 1.27, *Hom. in Jer.* 1. 16; 19.14, *In Rom.*, *passim*., and *In Jesu Nave* 4.2. Given the influence of Origen on Greek patristic theology in general, it would not be unreasonable to conjecture that Origen's occasional use of Romans 6 in reference to Christian baptism played some role in the fourth-century rediscovery of this orientation in initiation theology and practice throughout the Christian East.

[9] See in particular *In Jesu Nave* 4.1-2 and 5.1. For additional references and discussions of Origen's baptismal theology see C. Blanc, 'Le Baptême d'après Origène' in *Studia Patristica* 11 (1972), pp.113-124; H. Crouzel, 'Origène et la structure du sacrament' in *Bulletin de littérature ecclesiastique* 2 (1962), pp.81-92; J. Daniélou, *Bible and Liturgy* (Notre Dame, 1956), pp.99-113; *Idem*., 'Origen's Theology of the Sacraments' in *Origen* (New York 1955), pp.52-61; and J. Laporte, 'Models from Philo in Origen's Teaching on Original Sin' in *Laval théologique et philosophique* 44, 2 (1988), pp.191-203 (Reprinted in LWSS, pp.101-117).

the Logos[1] upon the waters, also refers to the Jordan event as the paradigm for baptism and describes baptism itself primarily as new birth and new creation.[2]

In none of these authors, however, is there any clear evidence as to the day on which the rites of initiation were celebrated or to the duration of the period of the pre-baptismal catechumenate. In his *Stromata* Clement uses an agricultural image from the Mosaic Law about the first-fruits of a new tree being dedicated to God after 'three years' growth' to refer to the necessity of catechesis.[3] But it is by no means clear that Clement has a literal three-year *pre-baptismal* catechumenate in mind since the context of this reference is a general discussion of the Mosaic Law as the source of all ethics and, in particular, the four 'virtues' to be possessed by the true Gnostic.[4] In any event, beyond this rather cryptic passage there are no other references to a possible three-year catechumenate within early Egyptian patristic documents. What we discover instead are a few references to a forty-day period of fasting, a period apparently separate from both the weekly stational fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays and the six-day pre-paschal fast.

> (Origen, *Hom. in Lev.*, X.2): 'They fast, therefore, who have lost the bridegroom; we having him with us cannot fast. Nor do we say that we relax the restraints of Christian abstinence; for we have the *forty days consecrated to fasting*, we have the fourth and sixth days of the week, on which we fast solemnly'.[5]
>
> (Peter of Alexandria, *Canon* 1): ' . . . for they did not come to this of their own will, but were betrayed by the frailty of the flesh; for they show in their bodies the marks of Jesus, and some are now, for the third year, bewailing their fault: it is sufficient, I say, that from the time of their submissive approach, *other forty days* should be enjoined upon them, to keep them in remembrance of these things; *those forty days* during which, though our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ had fasted, he was yet, after he had been baptized, tempted by the devil. And when they shall have, during these days, exercised themselves much, and constantly fasted, then let them watch in prayer, meditating upon what was spoken by the Lord to him who tempted him to fall down and worship him: "Get behind me, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve".'[6]
>
> (CH 12): 'Then, during *forty days* they [the catechumens] are to hear the word and if they are worthy they are to be baptized'.[7]
>
> (CH 20): 'The fast days which have been fixed are Wednesday, Friday, *and the Forty*. He who adds to this list will receive a reward, and whoever diverges from it, except for illness, constraint, or necessity, transgresses the rule and disobeys God *who fasted on our behalf*.[8]

---

[1] On the invocation of the Logos in this prayer and in the anaphora, see below, pp.25ff.

[2] Numbers of the prayers in SAR in the text are given according to the order of MS. Lavra 149, not according to the re-arrangment published by F. E. Brightman, 'The Sacramentary of Serapion' (hereafter, 'Sacramentary') in *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1900), pp.88-113, 247-277, which was followed by F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, vol. 2, (Paderborn, 1905), pp. 158-195.

[3] *Stromata* II. 18.

[4] See P.Th.Camelot, *Les Stromates*, II (SC 38, Paris, 1954), p. 107, note 1, and Bradshaw, *Search*, pp.116-117. Were it not for the reference to a three-year general catechumenate in AT 17, Clement's metaphorical use of this agricultural image would probably not even be noted.

[5] GCS 29, 445; ET from Talley, *Year*, p. 192 [emphasis added].

[6] ANF VI, 269 [emphasis added]. The fact that Peter does refer to a 'three-year' period of penance has been explained by Bradshaw as due to the influence of AT in Egypt. See Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice,' p. 10. In a recent conversation, however, he has suggested, alternatively, that it well may be such a three-year penitential period that ultimately gave rise to a similar catechumenal period.

[7] ET in Bradshaw, *Canons*, p. 19 [emphasis added].

[8] *Ibid.*, p.25 [emphasis added].

Of the above quoted texts, only CH 12, an obvious revision of the reference to a three-year catechumenate in AT 17[1], makes a clear correlation between a forty-day period and the baptismal preparation of catechumens. But if these references to a forty-day period were the only ones we possessed from the Egyptian liturgical tradition there would be no reason whatsoever to conclude that something other than a pre-paschal *Lent* modelled on Jesus' forty-day fast in the wilderness was intended.

On the basis of evidence supplied by the later Coptic liturgical tradition, however, both Thomas Talley and Paul Bradshaw have argued that this forty-day fasting period indicated in these early sources was actually a forty-day *pre-baptismal* fast for catechumens begun on the day after Epiphany (January 6). The tenth-century *Annals* of the Melchite patriarch Eutychius and the fourteenth-century Abu 'l-Barakat both claim that within the early Alexandrian tradition baptisms were celebrated on the sixth day of the sixth week of a forty-day fast which began immediately after the celebration of the Epiphany.[2] In other words, following the chronology of the opening events of Jesus' baptism and forty-day temptation in the wilderness in the Gospel of Mark—the Gospel traditionally associated with the Church of Alexandria—this preparation period for catechumens (and perhaps for penitents and the whole community) concluded forty days later—in mid-February—with the solemn celebration of baptism. And, according to Talley, in conjunction with baptism itself a passage was read from a now lost secret Gospel of Mark (the *Mar Saba Clementine Fragment*)[3] which, between the canonical Mark 10.34 and 10.35, describes an initiation rite administered by Jesus himself to an unnamed Lazarus-like figure whom Jesus had raised from the dead six days earlier in Bethany.[4]

If current scholarship is correct in seeing a correlation between the pre-Nicene references to a forty-day fast in Origen and Peter of Alexandria and the later Egyptian claims about this period as a time for baptismal preparation, then the uniqueness of the early Egyptian catechetical period vis-à-vis other early Christian traditions is certainly underscored. But to be fair to the sources, the references in both Origen and Peter—as well as that of CH 20 for that matter—are not clearly concerned with *baptismal* preparation. They are, instead, references to a forty-day fasting period with no particular specified relationship to either baptism or the liturgical year. If this fasting period did commence immediately after Epiphany in early Egypt, it probably would be better to suggest that it ultimately *became* the suitable time for the pre-baptismal catechumenate simply because pre-baptismal preparation in early Christianity normally included a period of fasting. How early this period of forty-days became the catechumenal period in Egypt, therefore, is not certain. That this is the case with CH 12 in *c.* 336 seems clear, but the scarcity of early evidence does not permit us to conclude that this was already so in the time of Origen.

Along with the apparent and unique forty-day, post-Epiphany period for pre-baptismal catechesis within the early Egyptian tradition, the unique *nature* of the Egyptian catechumenate itself has also been noted. Based on a number of elements from different sources Bradshaw concludes that the *character* of the early Egyptian catechumenate was

---

[1] References to chapters of AT are according to the numbering system of B. Botte, *La Tradition apostolique de saint Hippolyte* (Münster, 1963), and, where texts are cited directly in English they are from G. Cuming, *Hippolytus: A Text for Students*, hereafter, *Hippolytus* (GLS 8, Grove Books: Bramcote, Nottingham, 1976).

[2] For pertinent texts and further discussion see Talley, *Year*, pp.194ff., and Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice' pp.5-10..

[3] See Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge 1973).

[4] On the later post-Nicene shift of both this forty-day period to a pre-paschal location and the baptismal day itself, as well as the influence of this tradition upon the forty-days of Lent within the Church in general, see below, pp.48-50.

quite distinct in relationship to what is known of the catechumenate elsewhere in the fourth century. Such elements include:

(1) a single final scrutiny (with no exorcism) taking place a few days before baptism in the CH 19 revision of the reference to daily exorcism in AT 20;

(2) a reference to candidates entering the baptistery for the giving of their names, examination, and prayer in a baptismal *ordo* within the Ethiopic version of AT[1]; and

(3) a description in the tenth-century letter of Macarius of a (possibly conflated) ceremony of enrolment and scrutiny, called *Fishishin* (scrutiny), held two days before baptism.[2]

Further confirmation of this single scrutiny within Egypt might be supplied by SAR 8, the 'Prayer for Those being Baptized':

> 'God of truth, we implore you for this your servant and we pray that you would make him worthy of the divine mystery and your inexpressible new birth. For to you, lover of humanity, he is now offered; to you we have devoted him. Graciously grant that he may share in this divine new birth so that he may no longer be led by the wicked and evil one but, being guided by your only-begotten word, he may give worship to you always and keep your commandments. For through him the glory and the power (be) to you in the Holy Spirit both now and to all the ages of ages. Amen.'[3]

Parallels between this prayer and the one supplied in the baptismal *ordo* within the above noted Ethiopic version of AT (e.g., common references to the transition from evil, the reception of a new birth, and a focus on new obedience) strongly suggest that SAR 8 either also belongs to this immediate pre-baptismal scrutiny, or, alternatively, as in the letter of Macarius, represents a conflation of enrolment and scrutiny.

Another unique ceremony also may have taken place within the Egyptian catechumenate, a ceremony which, so far, has escaped scholarly attention. CH 20 not only specifies the two fasting periods of Wednesdays and Fridays and the 'forty', but also gives the following direction: 'There is to be sent by the bishop to the catechumens bread purified by prayer, so that they may share in the fellowship of the Church'. To my knowledge no clear parallels to this practice exist outside of Egypt. The corresponding passage in AT 26 refers to the *faithful* at an agape receiving 'blessed' bread from the hand of the bishop and to a reception of 'exorcised' bread by the catechumens. A similar passage in AT 28, again in an agape context, says that catechumens are to receive 'exorcized' bread from the hand of a priest or deacon. But neither passage refers to such bread being *sent* to catechumens nor gives any reason why catechumens are to be included.

What makes CH 20 particularly intriguing as a catechumenal reference, however, is the possible parallel to be noted within the baptismal materials incorporated into the Ethiopic version of AT.[4] Here there is a prayer for the consecration of bread, water, and oil included precisely within the catechumenal rites for either enrolment or scrutiny. Similarly, SAR 17, 'Prayer for the Oil of the Sick or for Bread or Water', follows immediately after two prayers intended for the consecration of the *baptismal* oils, perhaps underscoring some kind of overall initiatory context for the inclusion of all three of these prayers together at

---

[1] See G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici*, hereafter, Horner, (London, 1904), pp.162-164.

[2] Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice', pp.10-12.

[3] English translations of SAR are from *Prayer* based on the published Greek editions of Brightman, 'Sacramentary', and Funk, in comparison with MS. Lavra 149 itself.

[4] See Horner, p.164, and Kretschmar, 'Beiträge,' pp.30 and 35.

this place within the manuscript.[1] And, it should be noted, Clement of Alexandria in his *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 82, again in a baptismal context, also refers to the 'sanctification' of bread and oil. While the use of water, bread, and oil certainly became associated with the Church's ministry to the sick within the Egyptian liturgical tradition[2], as already seems to be the case with SAR 17, the general initiatory context of all these references might well suggest that there was once some kind of Egyptian prebaptismal custom surrounding the use of blessed bread for catechumens during their 'forty days' of preparation.

THE RITES OF CHRISTIAN INITIATION

If the forty-day, post-Epiphany catechumenate leading to the celebration of baptism on the sixth day of the sixth week of the fast represents a unique characteristic of the early Egyptian liturgical tradition, the rites of initiation themselves appear to find their closest parallel with those of the early Syrian Christian tradition. Kretschmar, for example, has argued that this parallel between the early Egyptian and Syrian rites is so close that one can even speak of a common 'root relationship.'[3] Signs of this relationship include the great importance attached to the non-exorcistic pre-baptismal anointing, a structure of renunciation-*syntaxis*, and the apparent fourth-century introduction of a post-baptismal anointing.

The Pre-Baptismal Anointing

There is no question that the pre-baptismal anointing in the Egyptian liturgical tradition eventually became exorcistic in emphasis and meaning as in other Western and Eastern rites of the fourth century. Derived as it is from AT 21, the 'Chapter of the Catechumens' in CH 19 refers to the pre-baptismal anointing with the 'oil of exorcism,' and Bradshaw is convinced that it is from the influence of AT that this meaning entered the Egyptian tradition in the first place.[4]

Apart from this reference, other Egyptian sources do appear to reflect a rather different understanding of the role and function of this anointing. Origen, for example, refers to baptism 'in the Holy Spirit and the water,'[5] and elsewhere writes that 'the unction of chrism and the baptism have continued in you undefiled.'[6] Similarly, Didymus the Blind writes that 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit were we both sealed and baptized.'[7]

In addition to these sources, which certainly may be interpreted as underscoring a particular ritual sequence of anointing and baptism, terminology elsewhere referring to the oil used for this anointing may also be significant. As Bradshaw notes, the *Canonical Responses* attributed to Timothy of Alexandria (*c.* 381) simply calls this 'the anointing of oil,' Cyril of Alexandria calls it 'the chrism of catechesis,' and SAR 15, 'Prayer for the Oil of Those Being Baptized', refers to it only as '*aleimma*' ('oil'). In his opinion, the later Coptic rite, with its unique designation of this oil as 'the *agallielaion* (oil of gladness) of the oil of

---

[1] On the literary and liturgical relationship of these three prayers see Cuming, 'Thmuis Revisited', pp.575ff.; Johnson, 'A Fresh Look', pp.167-168; and chapters II and III of *Prayers*.

[2] Cf. *The Life of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples*, trans. A. Veilleux (Cistercian Pub., Inc., Kalamazoo, 1980), pp.68, 328-329.

[3] Kretschmar, 'Beiträge,' pp.36, 47-48.

[4] Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice,' pp.13-14.

[5] *In Rom.* 5.8.

[6] *In Lev.* 6.5.

[7] *De Trin.* 2.15.

exorcism,' represents a mixture of the earlier non-exorcistic focus of this anointing with that brought about due to the influence of AT in Egypt.[1]

For further evidence in support of an early non-exorcistic interpretation of this anointing Bradshaw looks to a legend recorded in Severus of El-Asmunein's tenth-century *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church.*[2] According to this legend, an Antiochene woman, while on a voyage to Alexandria, uses her own blood to sign her children on the forehead and breast and then baptizes them. As an *Egyptian* legend Bradshaw sees this as confirming 'the great importance apparently attached to the inclusion of this pre-baptismal anointing.'[3]

Both Kretschmar and Bradshaw appeal to the contents of SAR 15 in support of their thesis about the importance of this non-exorcistic, pre-baptismal anointing in early Egypt. Indeed, both of them are of the opinion that a post-baptismal anointing with chrism was a fourth-century development and an addition to the Egyptian initiation rites.[4] And both imply that, while SAR 15 may reflect this earlier theological focus, SAR 16, 'Prayer for the Chrism with which the Baptized are Anointed', represents the fourth-century theological shift and addition. A closer look at the language of SAR 15, therefore, is in order.

> 'Master, lover of humanity and lover of souls, compassionate and merciful, God of truth, we call upon you, following and obeying the promises of your only-begotten, who has said, "If you forgive the sins of any they are forgiven them." And we anoint with this oil those who approach this divine rebirth, imploring that our Lord Christ Jesus may work in it and reveal healing and strength-producing power through this oil, and may heal their soul, body, spirit from every sign of sign of sin and lawlessness or satanic taint, and by his own grace may grant forgiveness to them so that, having no part in sin, they will live in righteousness. And, when they have been moulded again through this oil and purified through the bath and renewed in the Spirit, they will be strong enough to conquer against other opposing works and deceits of this life which come near them, and so be bound and united to the flock of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and inherit the promises to the saints. For through him (be) to you the glory and the power in holy Spirit unto all the ages of ages'.

Is it true, as Bradshaw asserts, that the overall function of this prayer for the consecration of the pre-baptismal oil 'was seen as healing and re-creation?'[5] It is certainly the case that these themes are present (e.g., references to 'those who approach this divine rebirth,' and to being 'moulded again through this oil'), but it is equally true that exorcistic and combat themes also play an important role. The 'healing' to which the prayer refers is to be a healing 'from every sign of sin and lawlessness or satanic taint', and the 're-creation' or 'moulding' is so that the newly initiated will be strong enough to conquer 'opposing works and deceits.' Furthermore, a ritual sequence which presupposes already the presence of a post-baptismal anointing may be indicated by the phrase, 'moulded again through this oil and purified through the bath and renewed in the Spirit.' And, finally, the reference to 'dying to sin and living to righteousness,' may well indicate the influence of a later paschal rather than Jordan or 'new birth' baptismal interpretation.

As early as 1900 Paul Drews suggested that this prayer, along with SAR 16 and 17, was Sarapion's mid-fourth century revision of an older pre-baptismal oil prayer.[6] And, given

[1] Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice,' p.13.

[2] B. Evetts (ed.), *Severus. History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church* (Paris, 1948: PO 1).

[3] Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice,' pp.12-13.

[4] On this, see below, pp.14-16.

[5] Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice,' p.12.

[6] Paul Drews, 'Über Wobbermins "Altchristliche liturgische Stücke aus der Kirche Aegyptens",' in *Zeitschrfit für Kirchengeschichte* 20 (1900), pp.432-434.

the close relationship in literary style and vocabulary between all three of these 'oil prayers' in SAR[1], if a post-baptismal anointing and its consecration prayer are new additions to an earlier rite, then it is precisely a concomitant revision of the prayer for the pre-baptismal oil reflecting this changed situation that one would expect. While some indication of the earlier interpretation of the pre-baptismal anointing thus continues to be reflected in SAR, it appears that this prayer moves in the direction of an 'exorcistic' interpretation and is thus subordinated to both baptism proper and the post-baptismal anointing to follow. By itself, therefore, the content of SAR 15 is too mixed in focus to provide conclusive evidence for the 'earlier' interpretation of this anointing suggested by both Kretschmar and Bradshaw.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that within the prayers specifically designated as baptismal in SAR, that is, SAR 7-11, the presence of a non-exorcistic, pre-baptismal anointing could be presumed. SAR 9, 'Prayer After the Renunciation', asks specifically that God would 'seal the assent (*sugkatathesin*)' of the candidate, and SAR 10, 'Prayer After the Reception,' refers clearly to the presence of the Holy Spirit—including the document's rare use of the definite article in relationship to the Spirit[2]—within a *pre-baptismal* context.

Although the language of SAR 9 seems to refer to some kind of profession or *syntaxis* having taken place, CH 19 directs that between renunciation and *syntaxis* the candidate is to be anointed with the 'oil of exorcism'. Since SAR 9 is entitled 'Prayer After the Renunciation', it may be that a similar practice is intended here. But since later Coptic tradition tended to place the pre-baptismal anointing *after* the *syntaxis* itself[3], and since SAR 9 uses 'sealing' language in relationship to this 'assent', it may be also that the pre-baptismal anointing had already moved to this location in the mid-fourth century. F. E. Brightman was so convinced that the pre-baptismal anointing was to be located here between SAR 9 and 10 that he inserted SAR 15 at this point in his edition and, contrary to any manuscript evidence whatsoever, changed the title of SAR 10 to read 'Prayer After the Anointing'.[4] But while Brightman *may* have been correct in the location of the pre-baptismal anointing, it does not follow that either SAR 15, which is apparently a prayer of *consecration* for this oil, should be inserted at this point or that the title of SAR 10 should be changed accordingly. SAR 10, in fact, may be a reference to a shift in ritual location from outside to inside the baptistery, much as appears to be indicated in the fourth-century mystagogical catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem[5], and in later Coptic practice as well.[6] And, if this is the case, there is no reason why an alternative location for a pre-baptismal anointing could not have been here *following* SAR 10.

Renunciation, Syntaxis, and the Baptismal Formula

The structure of pre-baptismal *apotaxis*, renunciation of Satan, and *syntaxis*, or 'act of adherence', has often been regarded as a unique feature of the Syrian liturgical tradition as that tradition is attested in the fourth-century catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. For initiatory practice in Egypt the assumption has been that, instead of this structure, the profession of faith was made only within the context of baptism proper according to an interrogatory form similar to that present in

[1] See Johnson, 'A Fresh Look,' p.166, and Chapters II and III of my *Prayers*.

[2] Other than in the prayer for the consecration of the post-baptismal chrism, SAR 16, the only place in SAR where the prayers use the definite article in relationship to the Holy Spirit is in SAR 8 and 10, both of which are in a pre-baptismal context.

[3] See DBL, pp.90-94.

[4] Brightman, 'Sacramentary', p.264.

[5] MC 1.11.

[6] See DBL, p.95.

AT 21. Such an interrogatory form for the profession is certainly attested in the early Egyptian tradition. According to Emmanuel Lanne, evidence for this is present in the writings of Origen, Dionysius, Didymus the Blind, and Cyril of Alexandria.[1]

At the same time, however, Lanne has also demonstrated that a five-fold profession, equivalent to the Syrian *syntaxis* and present in the later Coptic order of baptism, also has its roots in the early Egyptian tradition. This five-fold *syntaxis* consisting of a profession of faith in the one God, the only-begotten Son, the Holy Spirit, the 'life-giver', in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church is attested as early as A.D. 324 in a letter of Alexander of Alexandria to Alexander of Thessalonika and may, in fact, be earlier than this.[2] Some form of *syntaxis* distinct from the baptismal interrogation ('I believe, and I submit myself to you and to all your service, O Father, Son, and Holy Spirit') is certainly present in CH 19, and, as noted above, SAR 9, with its petition that God would 'seal the assent (*sugkatathesin*)' of the candidate may also indicate the presence of some form of *syntaxis* for the baptismal liturgy at Thmuis, although the title of this prayer, like Book II. 8 of Timothy of Alexandria's *Canonical Responses*, mentions only 'renunciation'.

Related to the topic of renunciation and profession is the question of the use of an indicative baptismal formula. Reference already has been made to Didymus the Blind's statement in *De Trinitate* 2.15 that 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit were we both sealed and baptized,' which certainly appears to be a citation of a liturgical formula. But earlier than this late fourth-century reference (*c.* A.D. 381) is the evidence supplied by CH 19, where the interrogatory form of baptism from AT 21 is combined with a thrice-repeated trinitarian formula ('I baptize you in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, equal Trinity'). By *c.* 336, therefore, the baptismal formula, usually understood as having Syrian origins[3], had already entered the Egyptian liturgical tradition where, according to the later Coptic baptismal rite, it would eventually replace the credal interrogations altogether and, as in later Western rites, transfer the profession of the creed itself to an immediate pre-baptismal context.[4]

The Post-Baptismal Anointing

Within the above discussion of the pre-baptismal anointing the opinions of both Kretschmar and Bradshaw that a post-baptismal anointing with chrism was a fourth-century addition to the Egyptian rites of initiation have already been noted. That such an anointing was a part of those rites in the fourth century is certainly confirmed both by CH 19 and by SAR 16, 'Prayer for the Chrism with which the Baptized are Anointed'. But, according to Bradshaw, both of these documents may reveal only the beginnings of this development.

In support of this claim, Bradshaw points to two legends in the fourteenth-century 'Book of the Chrism'. The first of these tells the embarrassing story that, because the supply of chrism had run out in Alexandria, Athanasius had to write to the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Constantinople for assistance in composing prayers for the consecration of new chrism, and the second legend claims that it was Theophilus of Alexandria, having

[1] See E. Lanne, 'La confession de foi baptismale à Alexandrie et à Rome,' in A.M. Triacca and A. Pistoia (eds.), *La liturgie expression expression de la foi* (Rome, 1979: Bibliotheca 'Ephemerides Liturgicae' Subsidia 16), p.223.

[2] See *Ibid.*, pp.221-224.

[3] See E.C. Whitaker, 'The History of the Baptismal Formula' in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16 (1965), pp.1-12.

[4] On this see Bradshaw, *Canons*, p. 23, and *idem.*, 'Baptismal Practice', p.14.

been instructed by no less than an angel, who had introduced its use into Egypt. Both of these stories tend to underscore some kind of memory which associates the fourth century with an innovation in relationship to a post-baptismal anointing, and with the other evidence summarized above, may well corroborate the hypothesis that Egypt did not know a post-baptismal anointing until the fourth century.[1]

A clue to this development may be suggested within SAR itself. While it would be relatively easy, as we have seen above, to insert a pre-baptismal anointing somewhere into the group of baptismal prayers, SAR 7-11, it is not so easy to insert a post-baptismal anointing. Rather, SAR 11, 'Prayer After Being Baptized and Coming Up', reads like a blessing prayer to conclude the entire baptismal ritual.

> God, the God of truth and creator of all, the Lord of every creature, bless this your servant with your blessing. Show him pure in the new birth. Place him in communion with your angelic powers so that he may no longer be called flesh but spiritual, having a share of your divine and beneficial gift. May he be preserved until the end for you, the maker of all. Through your only-begotten Jesus Christ, through whom (be) to you the glory and the power in holy Spirit both now and unto all the ages of ages. Amen.

While F. E. Brightman re-arranged the manuscript order of SAR at this point by inserting SAR 16 immediately after SAR 11[2], there is really no compelling reason to do so. If the title of SAR 11 is taken at face value then it came immediately after the water bath as a concluding collect for this ritual act. Similarly, there is no reason to assume that anything else came after it. If this is a prayer of 'blessing', it may have functioned as the final dismissal of the rite. Indeed, it is quite possible to assert that SAR 7-11 by themselves constitute a rather complete baptismal ritual reflecting a relatively early baptismal theology centered in a Jordan event, new birth theology, even with the Holy Spirit referred to in a pre-baptismal context. But SAR 16, with its clear articulation that the post-baptismal anointing is the 'seal' for those who now receive 'the gift of the Holy Spirit' *after* baptism, accompanied by the sign of the cross, should more properly be viewed, together with the current formulation of SAR 15, as the result of fourth-century changes and innovations. In other words, it well may be that within SAR we see reflected two different theologies of Christian initiation because the prayers themselves reflect different literary, liturgical, and historical strata which have been joined together in this document.[3]

CONCLUSION

The rites of Christian initiation within the early Egyptian liturgical tradition contain both unique elements and well as significant parallels to the rites of other traditions. The indigenous, post-Epiphany, pre-baptismal fast of forty days concluding with initiation on the sixth day of the sixth week of the fast certainly makes the Egyptian tradition stand out in relationship to all other churches within Christian antiquity. Other elements noted within the Egyptian rites tend to find their closest parallels with the early Syrian tradition. And on the basis of these parallels it appears, therefore, that what happened in Egyptian initiation is quite similar to what Gabriele Winkler has described as taking place at the same time within the development of the Syrian rites. According to her, the earliest Syrian and Armenian strata ritualized initiation on the basis of the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan,

---

[1] Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practisce', pp.15-16.
[2] Brightman, 'Sacramentary', p.252.
[3] See chapters II and III of *Prayers*.

interpreted it as a ritual of new birth in the light of John 3, and focussed on the pre-baptismal anointing as the pneumatic assimilation of the candidate to the priesthood and kingship of Christ. In the fourth century, however, this process underwent a complete transformation, resulting in the introduction of a post-baptismal anointing understood as conferring the Holy Spirit, a reinterpretation of initiation itself according to the Pauline death and burial imagery of Romans 6, and a new exorcistic focus on the pre-baptismal anointing as a rite of cleansing and preparation for the receiving of the Spirit.[1] If current scholarship on the Egyptian initiation rites is correct, Winkler's discussion of Syrian development could also serve as a fitting description for Egypt, a liturgical tradition from which some vestige of early practice apparently remains still in Coptic usage by the forbidding of baptisms between Palm Sunday and Pentecost.[2]

[1] G. Winkler, 'The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications' in *Worship* 52 (1978), pp.24-45, especially p.42, note 63 (Reprinted in LWSS, pp.58-81).
[2] See Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice', p.10.

2. Eucharistic Liturgy and Anaphora

According to Robert Taft, the celebration of the eucharistic liturgy within the early Egyptian liturgical tradition was, at first, limited to Sundays, as witnessed to by Athanasius (*contra Arianos* 11). By the late fourth century, both at Alexandria and within monastic practice, it was held also on Saturdays, and in the middle of the fifth century Cyril of Alexandria testifies to what appears to be a daily celebration in the patriarchal see. Prior to these developments, however, the fifth-century Byzantine historian, Socrates (HE V.22), notes that in addition to the regular Sunday celebration Egyptian practice had been the reception of communion from the presanctified gifts following a synaxis on the weekly fast days of Wednesdays and Fridays as well as on Saturdays.[1] As the culmination of full initiation into the Church, therefore, it becomes difficult to know whether Egyptian neophytes, initiated on the sixth day of the sixth week of the post-Epiphany fast, received their first communion at a special baptismal eucharist, from the presanctified gifts, or had to wait until the following Sunday.[2]

The question surrounding the relationship of the eucharist to initiation, however, is minimal compared with the problem of trying to determine the early Egyptian shape of the eucharistic liturgy itself. While we possess numerous anaphoral texts and fragments[3], we possess almost no early sources for the preanaphoral (introductory rites and liturgy of the word) or postanaphoral rites (i.e., communion rite and dismissal) with the notable, but problematic, exception of SAR. As with the early Egyptian initiation rites, therefore, so also in the study of the early eucharistic liturgy in Egypt scholars often only have at their disposal either later Egyptian documents or possible parallels within other early Christian traditions upon which to develop hypotheses about what may have been the case.

This chapter attempts to provide an overview of what reasonably may be said of the early Egyptian eucharistic liturgy. Although the section on the anaphora will be the primary focus, some attention will be given as well to the pre- and postanaphoral rites in order at least to provide an initial comprehensive picture of the entire eucharistic rite.

THE PREANAPHORAL RITES

The witness of the Coptic Liturgy of St. Mark, or 'Cyril' (hereafter, CMARK), is of great importance in attempting to discern the shape of the early Egyptian preanaphoral rites.[4] Although it is not certain when CMARK is to be dated, Geoffrey Cuming has concluded that 'it must have been in existence soon after 451, when the Monophysite schism took place, but it may have existed long before that date'.[5] Nevertheless, in relationship to the later Greek Liturgy of St. Mark (hereafter, GMARK), Cuming noted further that 'it is clear that after the schism each liturgy continued to be influenced by the other, while making its own additions, expansions, and substitutions'.[6]

---

[1] For this development as well as additional references see R. Taft, 'The Frequency of the Eucharist Throughout History', BEW, pp.63, 67.
[2] See Bradshaw, 'Baptismal Practice', pp.16-17.
[3] See below, pp.18ff.
[4] For an English translation of this liturgy see LEW, pp.144-193. For a recent study see Cuming, *St Mark*.
[5] Cuming, *St. Mark*, p.XXXII.
[6] *Ibid.*, p.XXXII.

Whatever the earliest possible dating of CMARK may be, the preanaphoral section of its current shape contains the following order:

Preliminaries

Prothesis

Enarxis

The First Prayer of the Morning

A Prayer Over the Prothesis of the Holy Oblation

A Prayer of Absolution

A Prayer of the Incense (including a short form of the Three Great Prayers for peace, the patriarch, and the congregations)

A Prayer After the Incense

Liturgy of the Word

A Prayer After the Apostle (Epistle of St. Paul)

A Prayer After the Catholicon (Catholic Epistle)

A Prayer of Incense (Before the Acts of the Apostles)

The Trisagion

A Prayer Before the Gospel

A Prayer After the Gospel

The Sermon

The Prayer of the Veil (Ascribed to John of Bostra, d. 650)

Intercessions

Synapte

The Three Great Prayers (for peace, the patriarch, and the congregations)

The Creed

A Prayer for the Kiss of Peace (ascribed to Severus of Antioch, d. 538)[1]

Most of these elements, of course, are later additions to what would have been an earlier shape of the preanaphoral rite. For example, the prayers called 'Of the Veil' and 'for the Kiss of Peace', at least in their current form, are identified already within the rite itself as additons. Similarly, the Trisagion (probably added before *c.* 518), the recitation of the Creed (added between *c.* 489 and *c.* 511), the Preliminaries (which in GMARK are expanded considerably), and almost everything in the Enarxis and Liturgy of the Word—except for the First Prayer of the Morning and, presumably, the Sermon—are subsequent additions to an earlier core. But there is no reason to conclude that many of these were not already in place in some form by *c.* 451.

Prior to the inclusion of these 'additions', however, the shape of the early Alexandrian preanaphoral rites well may have been the following:

First prayer of the morning

Readings from Scripture

The synapte and the Three Prayers

The kiss of peace

The transfer of the eucharistic gifts to the altar[2]

Possible confirmation of this presumed earlier shape is provided by SAR 19-30. Although these prayers probably reflect a local Egyptian usage rather than the rite of Alexandria itself, numerous parallels both in overall structure and content can be noted. SAR 19, 'First Prayer of the Lord's Day', for example, appears to provide a structural parallel to the 'First Prayers' in both versions of MARK and, by title, at least, may even point to a

[1] LEW, pp.144-193.

[2] See Cuming, *St Mark*, p.101.

period in Egypt before the eucharistic liturgy came to be celebrated on other days in addition to Sunday.[1] SAR 20 and 21, 'after the Homily,' and 'for the Catechumens,' respectively, have some correspondence with the synapte in CMARK (e.g., a focus on the catechumenate). And the themes and contents of SAR 22 ('for the sick'), 23 ('fruitbearing' or harvest), 24 ('for the Church'), 25 ('for the bishop and the Church'), and 27 ('for the people') are closely related to the synapte, the Three Prayers, and the anaphoral intercessions in both CMARK and GMARK. If the traditional mid-fourth century date for SAR is accepted, therefore, the 'preanaphoral rite' of this document, with some exceptions (e.g., SAR 26, 'Prayer of Genuflexion', and SAR 28-30, prayers of 'handlaying' or dismissal for the catechumens, sick, and faithful for which there are no parallels in either version of MARK), may well point to one earlier form of what is found in the later Coptic and Greek preanaphoras.

Nevertheless, the presence of handlaying or dismissal prayers in the 'preanaphora' of SAR, in fact, may be evidence that fourth-century Egyptian liturgy, like that of Syria, once also knew the liturgical structure of prayer, blessing, and dismissal for various categories of people within the liturgical assembly.[2] And, it should be noted, the posture for prayer implied in SAR 26, 'Prayer of Genuflexion', does have some correspondence to both CMARK, where the faithful are directed to alternate between kneeling and standing for prayer and to mid-fourth century Syrian practice, where the faithful again are to kneel for a litany following the dismissal of penitents.[3] Although the handlaying or dismissal prayers and 'Prayer of Genuflexion' in SAR do not have exact parallels in the later Egyptian tradition, they do have some relationship to an overall fourth-century context and, therefore, may be an indication of earlier elements which simply did not remain a part of the later Egyptian preanaphora.

The major problem in interpreting the so-called 'preanaphora' in SAR, however, is that we cannot be absolutely certain that SAR 19-30 are intended specifically for the preanaphoral rites. A note appended to SAR 30 in the manuscript that 'all these prayers are accomplished before the prayer of offering' has, of course, been almost universally accepted as evidence that these prayers are to be seen as 'preanaphoral'. But if, as both Theodor Schermann[4] and Cuming[5] have suggested, this note was added by the eleventh-century copyist in an attempt to cover the error of beginning his transcription with the

[1] On this see J. Cooper and A. J. Maclean, *The Testament of Our Lord* (Edinburgh, 1902), p.164; C. W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (ACC 45, Westminster, 1964), p.35; W. Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church* (Westminster, 1968), p.151; and P. Bradshaw, *Daily Prayer in the Early Church*, hereafter, *Daily Prayer*, (New York, 1982), p.68. When the contents of this particular prayer are studied, scholars are actually divided as to the proper location of this prayer within the proanaphora. Was it offered in Thmuis before the readings or after the readings? For different answers cf. G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, hereafter, *Shape*, (Dacre, London, 1945), p.447; J. Mateos, *La célebration de la parole dans la liturgie byzantine* (OCA 191, Rome 1971), p.140; and Cuming, *St Mark*, p.97.

[2] Cf. AC VIII. 6-9, 15, 37, 39, and 41; and R. Taft, 'The Inclination Prayer Before Communion in the Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Comparative Liturgy' (hereafter 'Inclination Prayer') in *Ecclesia Orans* 3 (1986), p.41.

[3] See AC VIII.10 and John Chrysostom, *In Ep. II ad Cor. Hom. 18.3*.

[4] T. Schermann, 'Abendmahlsgebete im Euchologium des Serapion,' in *Aegyptische Abendmahlsliturgien des ersten Jahrtausends in ihrer überlieferung dargestellt*, *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums* 6.1-2 (Paderborn 1912), pp.102-103.

[5] Cuming, 'Thmuis Revisited', pp.569-570.

wrong side of the manuscript roll (i.e., beginning his transcription with the anaphora (SAR 1) rather than with SAR 15[1]) another interpretation is possible.

As early as 1920 Louis Duchesne suggested that SAR 19-30 should not be viewed as the official '*ordo liturgicus*' for the eucharistic liturgy of Thmuis but rather as prayers that might be used in a variety of different contexts.[2] And, although Duchesne's suggestion has not been generally accepted, this interpretation merits stronger consideration. If the note appended to SAR 30 is, indeed, an addition by the copyist it need only mean that the eleventh-century copyist understood these prayers as preanaphoral, not that they truly were preanaphoral in the original document. Rather, as a *collection* of prayers from which a selection could be made on various occasions (e.g., pre-baptismal catechesis, services of the Word, liturgy of the hours[3], services of healing, dismissals, *and* the preanaphora), SAR 19-30 perhaps only provide one example of the kind of materials ultimately used in the construction of both the preanaphoral rites and anaphoral intercessions within the Egyptian tradition. Although some parallels do exist between these prayers and the preanaphoral rites of CMARK and GMARK, one must be cautious, therefore, about accepting SAR 19-30 as a concrete example of a complete mid-fourth century preanaphoral rite.

THE ANAPHORA

No early Christian liturgical tradition has left us with more anaphoral texts and fragments than has the Egyptian tradition,[4] and, with the exception of that anaphora called 'Egyptian Basil' (hereafter, EgBAS),[5] these numerous sources underscore an anaphoral structure which is unique to that tradition. That is, unlike the anaphoral pattern usually referred to as either 'West Syrian' or 'Antiochene', which, in its fully-developed form, contains an invariable preface/thanksgiving, sanctus, post-sanctus, institution narrative, anamnesis (with offering), consecratory epiclesis, intercessions, and concluding doxology, the final form of the Egyptian anaphoral structure, as represented by both CMARK and GMARK, has the following outline:

- Preface/Thanksgiving
  - Praise for Creation
  - Offering (of 'this reasonable and bloodless service')
  - Intercessions
  - Introduction to the Sanctus
- Sanctus (without '*benedictus qui venit*')
- Epiclesis I (attached to the Sanctus by a petition to 'fill')
- Institution Narrative (attached in GMARK to Epiclesis I with 'hoti', 'for')
- Anamnesis (with offering verb in the aorist tense)
- Epiclesis II
- Final Doxology[6]

How this unique structure became the pattern of CMARK and GMARK, and how early this structure can be dated, are the questions with which contemporary scholarship

[1] Immediately before SAR 15 in the manuscript there is a title, *Proseuch. Sarapiônos Thmoueôs*, 'Prayer(s) of Sarapion of Thmuis', which, originally, may have been the title of the whole collection. Such at least was Cuming's conclusion. See *Ibid.*, p.570.

[2] L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship. Its Origin and Evolution* (London, 1920), p.79.

[3] On this, see below, pp.43-44.

[4] For a complete list of these documents see R. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. IV: *The Dypticbs* (OCA 238, Rome, 1991), pp.92-93, note 123.

[5] On EgBAS see below, pp.27f.

[6] For an English translation of GMARK in its final thirteenth-century form see PEER, pp.57-66.

has been concerned and the questions to be addressed in what follows. In so doing, major sections of this anaphora will be discussed in relationship to the other pertinent early texts and fragments referred to above. Finally, since EgBAS itself, having a structure more akin to the West Syrian or Antiochene model, ultimately became and still is the dominant eucharistic prayer within the Coptic liturgical tradition, some attention must be given to this anaphora as well.

Preface/Thanksgiving

Traditional scholarship tended to view the MARK structure of the preface as an anomaly within early Christian eucharistic euchology primarily because it was believed that the anaphora of SAR itself — which places the bulk of its intercessions only after the second epiclesis — represented the 'original' Egyptian pattern.

The Structure of the Anaphora of SAR

- Preface
  - Praise
  - Four short intercessory petitions
  - Introduction to the Sanctus
- Sanctus (with no *benedictus qui venit*)
- Epiclesis I (attached to the sanctus by a petition to 'fill')
- Bi-Partite Institution Narrative
  - Aorist-tense Offering of bread and recitation of bread words (attached with 'hoti')
  - Quotation of *Didache* 9:4
  - Aorist-tense Offering of cup and recitation of cup words (attached with 'hoti')
- Epiclesis II
- Intercessions
- Doxology

Hence, the presence of intercessions within the preface of MARK was viewed as a clumsy interpolation into a structure which in origin was thought to be similar to that of the West Syrian or Antiochene pattern.[1]

Most scholars today,[2] however, would interpret the structure of MARK's preface as reflecting the authentic and early indigenous Egyptian pattern, a pattern supported by the fourth-century anaphoral fragment called the *Strasbourg papyrus*. This fragment contains the following text:

> 'to bless you . . . night and day . . .
>
> you who made heaven and all that is in it, the earth and what is on earth, seas and rivers and all that is in them; you who made man according to your own image and likeness. You made everything through your wisdom, the light of your true Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; giving thanks through him to you with him and the Holy Spirit, we offer the reasonable sacrifice and this bloodless service, which all the nations offer you, from sunrise to sunset, from north to south, for your name is great among all the nations, and every place incense is offered to your holy name and a pure sacrifice.

---

[1] See F. E. Brightman, 'Sacramentary', p. 96.

[2] The one notable exception is Caesaré Giraudo, who still clings to the traditional view that intercessions in the Egyptian preface are an interpolation. See his *La struttura letteraria della preghiera eucaristica. Saggio sulla genesi letteraria di una forma* (Analecta Biblica 92, Rome, 1981), p.337, and his *Eucaristia per la Chiesa. Prospettive teologiche sull'eucaristia a partire dalla 'lex orandi'* (Aloisiana 22, Rome, 1989), pp.467-469.

Over this sacrifice and offering we pray and beseech you, remember your holy and only Catholic Church, and all your peoples and all your flocks. Provide the peace which is from heaven in all our hearts, and grant us also the peace of this life. The . . . of the land peaceful things towards us, and towards your holy name, the prefect of the province, the army, the princes, councils . . .

for seedtime and havest . . . preserve, for the poor of your people, for all of us who call upon your name, for all who hope in you. Give rest to the souls who have fallen asleep; remember those of whom we make mention today, both those whose names we say and whose we do not say . . . Remember our orthodox fathers and bishops everywhere; and grant us to have a part and lot with the fair . . . of your holy prophets, apostles, and martyrs. Receive through their entreaties these prayers; grant them through our Lord; through whom be glory to you to the ages of ages.'[1]

Although, because of its fragmentary nature, debate continues over whether or not this prayer with no sanctus, epiclesis, institution narrative, or anamnesis is an early, possibly late-second or early-third century, form of a *complete* anaphora[2], its contents and tri-partite structure of *praise*, *offering*, and *supplication* leading to a concluding doxology do provide a close parallel to the later prefaces of both CMARK and GMARK. Indeed, in order to complete the shape of the final versions of the full Egyptian anaphora in their MARK forms all that is needed is the addition of the sanctus and its introduction in place of *Strasbourg's* concluding doxology and the further addition of other characteristic anaphoral elements after the sanctus.[3]

Yet, in spite of the fact that the anaphora of SAR has its major intercessions in the 'West Syrian' or 'Antiochene' position after the (second) epiclesis, it is quite possible that the *Strasbourg papyrus* itself, or something very much like it, lies behind this prayer as well. There are, it should be noted, some close verbal parallels between SAR and *Strasbourg*, especially in the way that both connect their intercessions to the language of 'bloodless offering' :

SAR	Strasbourg
We offered this living sacrifice, the bloodless offering . . .	. . . we offer the reasonable sacrifice and this service . . .
And we implore you through this sacrifice . . .	Over this sacrifice and offering we pray and beseech you . . .
. . . and make one living catholic church	. . . remember your holy and only catholic church . . .
For we called upon you, the uncreated . . .	for all of us who call upon your name . . .
And we call out also for all who have fallen asleep, for whom also the memorial (is made). After the Announcement of the Names. Sanctify these souls for you know them all. Sanctify all who have fallen asleep in the Lord.	Give rest to the souls who have fallen asleep; remember those of whom we make mention today, both those whose names we say and whose we do not say . . .

[1] ET adapted from PEER, pp.53-54.

[2] In support of this prayer as an early and complete anaphora see G. Cuming, 'The Anaphora of St. Mark: A Study in Development' in *Le Muséon* 95 (1982), pp.115-129; E. Kilmartin, 'Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers' in TS 35 (1974), pp.268-287; and H. Wegman, 'Une anaphore incomplete? Les Fragments sur Papyrus Strasbourg Gr. 254', in R. Van Den Broek and M. Vermaseren (eds.), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions* (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1981), pp.432-450. For a view which offers a more cautious evaluation see Bryan D. Spinks, 'A Complete Anaphora? A Note on Strasbourg Gr. 254' in *The Heythrop Journal* 25 (1984), pp.51-59.

[3] On this see Cuming, 'Anaphora of St. Mark', pp.115-129.

Furthermore, if the sanctus and its introduction, the two epicleses, and the institution narrative are omitted from SAR as later additions, a tri-partite structure of *praise*, *offering*, and *supplication*, the very structure of *Strasbourg* itself, remains. The unique shape of the anaphora in SAR among Egyptian types, therefore, probably resulted from the placement of the sanctus and its introduction *not* at the *conclusion* of a 'Strasbourg-type' prayer, as certainly appears to be the case with the MARK forms, but in the middle between praise and offering, at the very place where 'Strasbourg' moved from praise into offering and supplication.[1]

Sanctus

The Egyptian form of the sanctus (with no *benedictus qui venit*) and its introduction, closely connected to the post-sanctus epiclesis, are unique and indigenous characteristics of Egyptian anaphoral structure. In all of the pertinent Egyptian sources—i.e., the anaphora of SAR, the *Deir Balyzeh Papyrus*,[2] the *British Museum Tablet*,[3] the *John Rylands* parchment,[4] and the *Louvain Coptic Papyrus*,[5] together with its fourth-century Greek original in Barcelona[6]—the epiclesis is always connected to the conclusion of the sanctus ('full of your glory') by a petition that God would now 'fill' the sacrifice being celebrated. The question, however, is how early did the Egyptian tradition know the anaphoral use of the sanctus, which because of its close connection to the first epiclesis, certainly appears to be integral to the overall Egyptian anaphoral pattern?

Traditional scholarship on the origins of the anaphoral use of the sanctus pointed to the early Egyptian tradition, particularly to the *De principiis* of Origen (*c.* 217) and to the anaphora of SAR, as indications of its original date and provenance.

SAR	Origen
. . . We praise you who know the Son and who reveal to the saints the glories concerning him; you who are known by your begotten Word and known and interpreted to the saints. . . .Give us holy Spirit, in order that we may be able to proclaim and describe your inexpressible mysteries. Let the Lord Jesus speak in us and let holy Spirit also hymn you through us. For you are above all rule and authority and power and dominion and every name being named, not only in this age but also in the coming one. Beside you stand a thous-	*De principiis* I.3,4: . . . all knowledge of the Father, when the Son reveals him is made known to us through the Holy Spirit. So that both of these, who in the words of the prophet [Habbakuk 3:2] are called "animals" or "living beings", are the cause of our knowledge of God the Father. *De principiis* IV. 3, 14: . . . since the beginning and end of all things could not be comprehended by any except our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, this was the

[1] For further details see Johnson, 'A Fresh Look', pp.178-180, and Ch. IV of *Prayers*. Cuming argued that a similar development can be seen in the Jerusalem anaphora described in MC V of Cyril of Jerusalem. See G. Cuming, 'The Shape of the Anaphora' in *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989), p.341.

[2] PEER, pp.79-80.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp.54-56.

[4] A. Hänggi and I. Pahl (eds.) *Prex Eucharistica* (Specilegium Friburgense 12, Fribourg, 1968), pp.124-127.

[5] PEER., pp.81.

[6] S. Janeras, 'L'original grec del fragment copte de Lovaina Núm. 27 en l'Anafora di Barcelona' in *Miscellània Litúrgica Catalana* 3 (1984), pp.13-25.

and thousands and a myriad myriads of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers. Beside you stand the two most-honored six-winged seraphim. With two wings they cover the face, and with two the feet, and with two they fly, sanctifying. With them receive also our sanctification as we say: Holy, holy, holy Lord of Sabaoth; heaven and earth are full of your glory.

reason why Isaiah spoke of there being in the vision that appeared to him two seraphim only, who with two wings cover the face of God, with two cover his feet, and with two fly, crying to one another and saying "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of thy glory" [Isa. 6:2-3].[1]

Because of the obvious parallels between the introduction to the sanctus in SAR and Origen's description of the Isaian sanctus, Gregory Dix concluded that:

> '*Sarapion's* Preface still faithfully reflects the old idea that the wings of the Seraphim veil "*The* Face" (i.e. of God), while *St. Mark* was adapted to the later notion of "*their* faces." And *Sarapion's* . . . reference to "the Lord Jesus speaking in us and the Holy Spirit hymning Thee through us" (i.e. in the Sanctus), still carries on the old idea of that hymn as sung to the glory of the Father primarily *by the Son and the Holy Ghost themselves*.'[2]

Dix further concluded from this that Origen himself already knew an anaphoral use of the sanctus in early third-century Alexandria from where it spread to the rest of Egypt 'and ultimately all over christendom'.[3] Alternatively, Georg Kretschmar argued that it was rather the *influence* of Origen's theological interpretation of the *Isaian* sanctus that led at Alexandria to its introduction into the anaphora during the *latter* half of the third century.[4] Nevertheless, in either case, the Egyptian origin of the anaphoral use of the sanctus was assumed.

Current scholarship has strongly challenged the Dix-Kretschmar assumption. In his recent work, *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer*[5], for example, Bryan Spinks builds a strong case for arguing that the origins of the anaphoral use of the sanctus are to be located not in Egypt but in Syria where, among Christians of a more Semitic orientation and background, the sanctus was appropriated and adapted for Christian use either from the synagogue or from traditions of Jewish mysticism. Similarly, Talley has also argued for the Syrian origins of the anaphoral sanctus, suggesting that, instead of direct borrowing from the Jewish synagogue, it came into anaphoral use from a Christianized version of synagogue morning prayer such as appears to be present in AC VII.35. [6]

---

[1] ET from G. W. Butterworth, *Origen on First Principles* (London, 1936), pp.32 and 311.

[2] G. Dix, 'Primitive Consecration Prayers' in *Theology* 37 (1938), p.275.

[3] G. Dix, *Shape*, p.165.

[4] G. Kretschmar, *Studien zum frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Tübingen, 1956), p.164.

[5] (Cambridge 1991), pp.87-93. See also B. Spinks, 'The Jewish Liturgical Sources for the Sanctus' in *The Heythrop Journal* 21 (1980), pp.168-179.

[6] See T. Talley, 'The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer' in *Worship* 58 (1984), p.414, and, more recently, *idem*., 'Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present, and Future' in D. Holeton (ed.), *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion* (AGLS 27, Grove Books, Ltd., Bramcote, Nottingham, 1994), pp.6-19.

Underscoring the unique form and primitive content of the Egyptian use, however, Robert Taft has recently restored the plausibility of the traditional Dix-Kretschmar approach. Taft concludes that:

> '... the Sanctus in Egypt, when it does appear, shows the characteristics Dix and Kretschmar note in Origen, is clear. It is also evident that the Sanctus is central to the flow of the reworked Egyptian anaphoral structure, and not just a crude interpolation. Kretschmar is certainly right, too, in viewing this Egyptian liturgical setting of the Sanctus as the result of the Judeo-Christian, Alexandrian exegesis of Is 6 adopted and developed by Origen, and in concluding that this influenced the Egyptian anaphoral tradition, and that decisively. But when? That this Sanctus is already in place ca. 350 in Sarapion is clear ... So just when, in the years between ca. 250-350, the Sanctus was actually interpolated into the Egyptian anaphoral structure is by no means clear on the basis of the evidence adduced. Kretschmar believes already in the third century, and though I am unable to confirm this dating, I also see no reason to challenge it.'[1]

That the origins of the anaphoral use of the sanctus may be Egyptian, and that the anaphora in SAR well may be an early and authentic witness to these origins, therefore, are still highly possible conclusions. And if they are correct, then the anaphoral sanctus passed from Egypt into Syria, not the other way around. But in Syria the particular *form* it took came not from Egypt itself but from either the Jewish or Christianized-Jewish sources suggested by Spinks and Talley.[2]

Epicleses I and II

In one of his studies on the origins and evolution of early Christian anaphoral structure, Talley notes, concerning the fully-developed Egyptian pattern, that:

> '... it was long common to suggest that [the] consecratory epiclesis following the anamnesis was the result of West Syrian influence. In recent years, however, several writers have suggested more radically that the entire "Alexandrian" anaphoral structure from Sanctus to final doxology is the result of such influence. Prior to that influence, the Alexandrian eucharistic prayer had a much more primitive form, the form preserved to us in Strasbourg papyrus 254.'[3]

While there is certainly some truth to this assertion of West Syrian influence in Egyptian euchology, to claim that the *entire* structure of the fully-developed Egyptian anaphora 'from Sanctus to final doxology' is due to this influence is simply unwarranted. As discussed above, the origin of the anaphoral use of the sanctus well may be Egyptian itself and, given the close relationship and structural dependency between the Egyptian form of the sanctus ('full of your glory') and the first epiclesis ('fill'), it would be difficult not to view at least *this* epiclesis as indigenous to Egypt as well.

---

[1] R. Taft, 'The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier, Part II', (hereafter 'Interpolation II'), OCP 58 (1992), pp.94-95. For a different view see G. Winkler, 'Nochmals zu den Anfängen der Epiklese und des Sanctus im Eucharistischen Hochgebet' in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 174 (1994), pp.214-231. Based on both the presence of the sanctus and of primitive forms of the epiclesis in the context of the pre-baptismal anointing in the Apocryphal Acts of the early Syrian tradition, Winkler suggests that the origins of the anaphoral use of the sanctus and epiclesis are to be located here within the early Syrian rites of Christian initiation rather than elsewhere. To this argument, especially as it relates to the SAR anaphora, I hope to return at a later date.

[2] See *Ibid.*, pp.119-121, and Bradshaw, *Search*, p.157.

[3] T. Talley, 'The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer' in *Worship* 58 (1984), p.416..

Furthermore, not all Egyptian sources have both an epiclesis after the sanctus and another following the anamnesis. Many scholars, in fact, agree that the Egyptian anaphoral tradition originally contained only a short epiclesis placed immediately after the sanctus. But as this tradition developed, the anaphora came to include either an elongated one prior to the institution narrative or, through the West Syrian influence noted above by Talley, *two* epicleses, with the explicit consecratory focus now located in the second one after the anamnesis.[1] Two of the probably late-fourth century anaphoral fragments—the *Deir Balyzeh Papyrus* and the *Louvain Coptic Papyrus*—provide examples of single post-sanctus elongated epicleses:

> *The Deir Balyzeh Papyrus*: 'Fill us also with the glory from (you), and vouchsafe to send down your Holy Spirit upon these creatures (and) make the bread the body of our (Lord and) Saviour Jesus Christ, and the cup the blood . . . of our Lord and . . .'[2]
> *The Louvain Coptic Papyrus*: 'Heaven and earth are full of that glory wherewityou glorified us through your only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, the first-born of all creation, sitting at the right hand of your majesty in heaven, who will come to judge the living and the dead. We make the remembrance of his death, offering to you your creatures, this bread and this cup. We pray and beseech you to send out over them your Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, from heaven . . . to make (?) the bread the body of Christ and the cup the blood of Christ of the new covenant.'[3]

These two local—rather than Alexandrian—examples provide us with what may reflect an original consistent Egyptian epicletic pattern, a pattern still partially reflected in both the Coptic and Greek anaphoras of MARK, where the post-sanctus petition to 'fill' the gifts with the Holy Spirit probably also 'originally included some kind of petition for consecration . . . : *some* consequence of "filling" must have been envisaged. It was probably removed when a second epiclesis was introduced after the anamnesis.'[4]

That this development toward a second epiclesis was already in motion in the middle of the fourth century, however, is also documented. The anaphoras of both the *British Museum Tablet* and SAR have two epicleses, a short invocation for the 'filling' of the sacrifice immediately after the sanctus and a second one, more explicitly 'consecratory' in focus, following the institution narrative and anamnesis, precisely the *structure* of the fully-developed Coptic and Greek forms of MARK. Although the earlier Egyptian anaphoral structure probably contained only one epiclesis, therefore, it is also clear that at least at Alexandria, and in some local liturgical traditions, this one post-sanctus epiclesis did not remain the only one for very long.

A closely-related issue within this Egyptian epicletic context, of course, concerns the question of whether it was orginally the Holy Spirit (as in most anaphoral sources) or the Logos (as in SAR) who was invoked to 'fill' and/or consecrate the eucharistic sacrifice. While past scholarship tended to view SAR here as reflecting an early and authentic Egyptian tradition, Bernard Capelle accused this mid-fourth century bishop of Thmuis of being an innovative *avant-garde* theologian, who deliberately substituted Logos for Holy Spirit in both the anaphora and the prayer for the consecration of the baptismal waters (SAR 7).[5] And Bernard Botte argued his highly influential hypothesis that SAR actually

---

[1] See R.-G. Coquin, 'L'Anaphore alexandrine de saint Marc' in *Le Muséon* 82 (1969), pp.329ff.; C.H. Roberts and B. Capelle, *An Early Euchologium: The Dêr-Balizeh Papyrus enlarged and re-edited* (Louvain 1949), p.52; J. van Haelst, 'Une nouvelle reconstitution du papyrus liturgique de Dêr-Balizeh' in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 45 (1969), p.210; and A. Baumstark, 'Die Anaphora von Thmuis und ihre Überarbeitung durch den h.l. Serapion' in *Römische Quartalschrift* 18 (1904), pp.132-134.

[2] PEER, 80.

[3] *Ibid.*, 81.

[4] Cuming, *St. Mark*, p.122.

[5] B. Capelle, 'L'Anaphore,' pp.425-443.

reflects a Semi-Arian or Pneumatomachian theological position of a half to an entire century later than the mid-fourth century, and the epicleses of the Logos, in particular, were an attempt to put the Holy Spirit 'in the shade'.[1]

With some exceptions[2], however, recent scholarship has restored the general conclusions of the traditional approach.[3] While no specific *liturgical* parallels to an epiclesis of the Logos are known in Christian antiquity, numerous parallels to this epiclesis in the eucharistic theologies of Clement of Alexandria[4], Origen[5], Justin Martyr[6], Irenaeus of Lyons[7], Athanasius[8], and even Cyril of Alexandria in the mid-fifth century[9] lead to the highly probable conclusion that SAR reflects neither innovation nor heresy. Rather, the baptismal and anaphoral epicleses of the Logos in SAR are, most likely, archaic remnants reflecting at least one authentic theological and liturgical tradition of Egypt, a tradition which ultimately changed as the result of late-fourth century pneumatological debate and doctrinal precision regarding the the trinitarian identity of the Holy Spirit. As Johannes Betz has written :

> 'The special *Logos-epiclesis* is already well attested for Egypt . . . It must therefore be treated in Sarapion as a primitive formula, not as a correction. If the Prayers of Sarapion do not yet have fully developed doctrinal precision regarding Logos and Pneuma, that is no valid argument against their authenticity.'[10]

Whatever the original shape and location of the Egyptian epiclesis may have been, therefore, it remains quite possible that rather than the Holy Spirit it was the Logos himself who was once invoked to 'fill' and/or 'consecrate' the eucharistic gifts with his presence, power, and participation.

Institution Narrative and Anamnesis

Although an institution narrative and anamnesis are present in the anaphora of AT 4, traditionally dated in the early third century (*c*. 215), it is difficult to know if this unit was actually in place in that prayer at that time. Bradshaw has recently argued that both the apparent absence of such a narrative in the fourth-century anaphoras known to Cyril of Jerusalem and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the various adaptations made of this prayer from AT 4 in other derived documents, make it more likely that this narrative was 'added to an older version of [AT 4] in the fourth century.'[11] Evidence certainly suggests that the

[1] B. Botte, 'L'Eucologe', pp.50-58. For a succint summary of the arguments of both Capelle and Botte see Lennard, *Sacramentary*, pp.7-9.

[2] Cf. M.-D. Dufrasne, 'Sérapion de Thmuis' in *Dictionnairre de Spiritualité*, vol. 14 (Paris, 1988), pp.643-657.

[3] Cf. Cuming, 'Thmuis Revisited', pp.568-575; *idem.*, *St Mark*, pp.XXXVI-XXXVII; Johnson, 'A Fresh Look', pp.163-183; *idem*, 'The Archaic Nature'; and *Prayers*.

[4] See *Paedagogus* 1.6, 43:2; 2.2, 19:4-20.

[5] See *Comm. in Matt.* 11:14; *Contra Celsum* 8:33; and *in Matt. ser.* 85.

[6] See *Apology* 1. 66, 2.

[7] See *Adversus Haereses* IV. 18, 5 and V. 2, 3.

[8] See PG 26, 1325 and/or PG 86, 2401.

[9] See *Comm. in Lucam.* 22:19-20, and E. Gebremedhin, *Life-Giving Blessing: An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria* (Uppsala, 1977), especially pp.63-70.

[10] J. Betz, as quoted by Cuming, *St Mark*, p.XXXVII. For a review of the pertinent literature see R. Taft, 'From Logos to Spirit: On the Early History of the Epiclesis' in A. Heinz and H. Rennings (eds.), *Gratias Agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet. Für Balthasar Fischer* (Friburg, 1992) pp.489-502. and G. Winkler 'Nochmals zu den Anfängen der Epiklese und des Sanctus im Eucharistischen Hochgebet' in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 174 (1994), pp.214-231.

[11] Bradshaw, 'Re-dating the *Apostolic Tradition*: Some Preliminary Steps' in J. Baldovin and N. Mitchell (eds.), *Festschrift for Aidan Kavanagh* (The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Forthcoming).

fourth century is the time period in which the institution narrative and anamnesis become an almost universal anaphoral feature. And, again, the early Egyptian liturgical tradition provides a possible example of how this development took place.

Whether the institution narrative and anamnesis have their origins in the Syrian (Jerusalem?) liturgical tradition[1] and from there passed into Egypt or originally developed in Egypt itself, there is no denying the unique constructions which characterize them even in the later Coptic and Greek versions of MARK. Unlike the institution narratives in the Syrian tradition and elsewhere, which are connected to the post-sanctus thanksgiving for the work of Christ by the use of a relative clause (e.g., 'who, in the night he was betrayed . . . '), all of the Egyptian anaphoral sources having the narrative attach it directly to the post-sanctus epiclesis by the use of 'for' or 'because' (Greek 'hoti'). Although this connecting link of 'hoti' need mean nothing more than fidelity to the Greek text of 1 Corinthians 11.23, scholars have often noted that such use suggests that the institution narrative in Egyptian anaphoral structure was understood as providing the ground and pivotal basis for the whole eucharistic action. In other words, we *do* this liturgical act '*because* the Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed . . . ' has given us the command and warrant to do so.[2]

Of primary significance concerning the institution narrative, however, is the bi-partite structure of this narrative in the anaphora of SAR, where the bread words and cup words are separated from each other by a citation from *Didache* 9.4.

> 'To you we offered this bread, the likeness of the body of the only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the holy body. For the Lord Jesus Christ, in the night when he was handed over, took bread, broke it, and gave to his disciples, saying: Take and eat, this is my body which is broken for you for the forgiveness of sins. Therefore we also offered the bread making the likeness of the death. And we implore you through this sacrifice, God of truth: be reconciled to us all and be merciful.
>
> And as this bread was scattered over the mountains and, when it was gathered together, became one, so also gather your holy church out of every nation and region and every city and village and house, and make one living catholic church.
>
> And we also offered the cup, the likeness of the blood. For the Lord Jesus Christ, taking a cup after supper, said to the disciples: Take, drink, this is the new covenant, which is my blood poured out for you for the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, we also offered the cup, presenting the likeness of blood'.

A similar citation of *Didache* 9.4 also occurs in the *Deir Balyzeh Papyrus*, but there, unlike SAR, its immediate post-epiclesis location functions as the introduction to an already unified narrative.

A number of contemporary scholars have found the unique bi-partite structure and citation of *Didache* 9.4 in SAR highly suggestive. Following the work of Klaus Gamber[3], Edward Kilmartin, for example, thought that it pointed back to an early time period in which a full community meal would have intervened between the specific eucharistic bread and cup rites themselves.[4] Similarly, both Louis Bouyer[5] and Enrico Mazza[6] have noted

[1] On this see E. Cutrone, 'The Liturgical Setting of the Institution Narrative in the Early Syrian Tradition' in J. N. Alexander (ed.), *Time and Community: In Honor of Thomas Julian Talley* (The Pastoral Press: Washington, D.C., 1990), pp.105-114.

[2] On this see A. D. Nock, 'Liturgical Notes 1: The Anaphora of Serapion', in *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929), p.385; Dix, *Shape*, p.167; and Cuming, *St Mark*, p.122.

[3] K. Gamber, 'Die Serapion-Anaphora, ihrem ältesten Bestand nach untersucht' in *Ostkrichbliche Studien* 16 (1967), pp.33-42.

[4] E. Kilmartin, 'Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Structure of Early Eucharistic Prayers' in TS 35 (1974), p.274.

[5] L. Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Notre Dame, 1968), p.208.

[6] E. Mazza, 'L'anaphora di Serapione: una ipotesi di interpretazione' (hereafter 'L'anaphora') in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 95 (1981), pp.512-518.

parallels between the *structure* of SAR here and the structure of AC VII.25[1], where the meal prayers of the *Didache* have been remodelled into a pattern consisting of thanksgiving over bread, the citation of *Didache* 9.4, and thanksgiving over the cup. Mazza, in particular, has argued that the structure of the institution narrative in SAR, based with AC VII.25 on a common (but unidentified) source is 'a truly unique and exceptional witness to the archaic and preanaphoric structure of eucharistic celebration.'[2] If the conclusions of these scholars are correct, then once again the importance and possible influence of the Egyptian liturgical tradition is underscored. The bi-partite structure of the instutition narrative in SAR well may reveal an early attempt to incorporate that narrative into the eucharistic anaphora in general.

Closely related to the institution narrative in the anaphoral structures of all traditions, of course, is the anamnesis, and an important issue for the Egyptian anaphora, in particular, is its unique use of offering language within that anamnesis. Because the fully-developed shape of the MARK forms of the Egyptian anaphora contain both a present-tense offering verb in the preface ('we offer') and an aorist-tense offering verb in the anamnesis ('we *offered*'), some scholars have suggested that the use of the aorist here points back specifically either to the preanaphoral act of placing the gifts of bread and wine on the altar (an '*offertory*')[3] or to the offering of the 'reasonable service' or 'unbloody sacrifice' (cf. Romans 12.1) understood as a sacrifice of praise, referred to in the preface.[4]

In support of the second alternative Dix pointed to the word 'unbloody' or 'bloodless' used in relationship to the heavenly sacrifice offered by the angels to God in the second-century *Testament of Levi* 6:3 and to the contrast between the bloodless sacrifices of Christians and those offered by pagans argued by the second-century Christian apologist Athenagoras, where the context of his reference (e.g., 'the lifting up of holy hands') likewise suggests prayer and praise.[5]

In his discussion of the development of MARK, Cuming added to these early references the *Contra Celsum* (8:21) of Origen (' . . . continually offering up bloodless sacrifices in his prayers to God') and the *Martyrium Apollonii* (14:1-3)—'I send up the bloodless and pure sacrifice . . . which is through prayers'—as further indications of the identification of prayer and praise with this 'unbloody offering'.[6] Even when, along with the citation of Malachi 1.11, the sacrifice becomes associated with the eucharistic *gifts* themselves in early patristic literature (e.g., in Justin and Irenaeus), the understanding of sacrifice as verbal prayer and praise does not entirely disappear.[7] From this development Cuming not only concluded that the personal notion of 'self-offering' is still present in some Egyptian anaphoras (e.g., the post-sanctus petition to 'fill us with your glory' in the *Deir Balyzeh Papyrus*), but that already in the *Strasbourg papyrus* itself, since the bread and cup had certainly been placed on the altar before the prayer began, sacrifice means both the gifts and the act of praise and thanksgiving. And, although the anaphora of SAR has only the aorist tense offering verb

[1] See PEER, pp.100-102.

[2] Mazza, 'L'anaphora', pp.518-519.

[3] See H. Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy* (E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1979), pp.157-158, and A. D. Nock, 'Liturgical Notes I', pp.382-383.

[4] Dix, *Shape*, p.166.

[5] Ibid., p.166. On the interpretation of sacrifice in early Christianity see R. Daly, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judeo-Christian Background before Origen* (Washington D.C., 1978), pp.338-339, and K. Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering* (The Liturgical Press, Pueblo Books: Collegeville, 1986), pp.26-27

[6] Cuming, 'Shape', p.124, and *idem.*, *St Mark*, pp.107-108.

[7] For texts see Cuming, *St Mark*, pp.107-108.

and no offering verb in the preface, Cuming further concluded that SAR, nevertheless:

> 'probably has the same conception of sacrifice, although he does not mention the word in his preface: but he does use the Romans [12.1] phrase in the past tense after the epiclesis, where it gives the grounds for the invocation: For we have offered to you this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering. "We have offered" after the Sanctus is equivalent to "we offer" in the preface of S[trasbourg].'[1]

With such language, however, it is necessary to proceed with the utmost caution. It would be wrong to expect a clear, consistent, and detailed systematic theological treatment of the eucharist as sacrifice in an ancient liturgical text or to assume, on the basis of the language of a classic liturgical text alone, that a theological distinction between different interpretations of 'eucharistic sacrifice' is clearly implied or intended. Rather, as Kenneth Stevenson has shown in his recent study of eucharistic offering[2], the metaphor of sacrifice applied to the eucharist can refer at one and the same time to the self-offering of the community, the gifts which are offered (bread and cup) in the liturgical rite, and to the entire eucharistic rite itself as the 'sacrifice' or 'offering' of the Church in response to God's gift of salvation in Christ.

The characteristic Egyptian use of the aorist for offering in the anamnesis, therefore, need not mean that the whole eucharistic sacrifice was understood already to have been offered. Rather, while other liturgical traditions used the present tense, Egyptian anaphoral texts from the fourth century on, for whatever reason, consistently phrased their anamnetic offering language by means of the aorist tense. Even if this, indeed, *may* point back — at least in part — to some preliminary act of placing the bread and cup on the altar, Taft has recently cautioned that one must 'tread lightly' and not conclude that such a reference would constitute the totality of what early Egyptian Christianity understood by eucharistic sacrifice.[3]

On the basis of the above discussion, the development of the unique anaphoral shape which characterizes CMARK and GMARK can be easily summarized. If current scholarship is correct, this development took place in the following manner:

1. The sanctus, its introduction, and concomitant epiclesis were added to the 'anaphora' of the *Strasbourg papyrus*, with the sanctus and its introduction now taking the place of the final doxology. Originally, this post-sanctus epiclesis was the only one within the Egyptian tradition.
2. Perhaps either under West Syrian or Antiochene influence, or based upon a source common to both Syria and Egypt (see SAR), the institution narrative and anamnesis were added. Attached to the epiclesis by the connecting link of 'for' or 'because', and phrasing its anamnetic offering verb in the aorist tense ('we *offered*'), these two anaphoral units reflect a unique and indigenous Egyptian euchological style.
3. Finally, under probable West Syrian or Antiochene influence, a second epiclesis was added in a post-anamnesis location, an epiclesis in which the specific 'consecratory' focus of the invocation of the Holy Spirit (or Logos) was now expressed.

That all of this was accomplished by the end of the fourth century, with the sanctus probably added already in the late third, seems quite certain.[4] But what is not so clear is the extent to which this final shape represents West Syrian or Antiochene liturgical influence

[1] Cuming, 'Shape', p.125.
[2] Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering*, pp.3-4.
[3] R. Taft, 'Understanding the Byzantine Anaphoral Oblation' (Forthcoming).
[4] See Cuming's 'conjectural reconstruction' of the mid-fourth century shape and contents of the anaphora of MARK in *St Mark*, pp.69-70. My only problem with his attempt is that he did not cite the Logos as a possible variant for the second epiclesis.

in Egypt. Indeed, because of the unique Egyptian characteristics noted above in the sanctus, first epiclesis, institution narrative, and anamnesis, the *most* that can still be said with any degree of certainty regarding the final form of Egyptian anaphoral structure is the traditional scholarly conclusion that the *second* epiclesis is probably the result of such 'foreign' influence in Egypt.

The Anaphora called EgBAS

The question of possible West Syrian or Antiochene influence on Egyptian liturgy naturally leads to a brief discussion of EgBAS, the anaphora which, in its final Bohairic Coptic form, is the most commonly used eucharistic prayer in the Coptic Orthodox Church today.[1] As noted above, this anaphora, which exists in numerous versions in addition to the Bohairic (i.e., Sahidic, Syriac, Armenian, Greek, and Ethiopic), follows the West Syrian or Antiochene anaphoral structure with a single epiclesis after the anamnesis and with the intercessions following that epiclesis near the end of the prayer.

This important prayer, an expanded Greek version of which appears in the Byzantine Rite (ByzBAS)[2], has been the subject of numerous detailed studies. The most recent work is that of John Fenwick, *The Anaphoras of St Basil and St James: An Investigation into their Common Origin*[3], which concludes that there once existed a Greek original (an UrBAS) which lies behind the various extant editions, a source most clearly reflected in the fragmentary seventh-century Sahidic Coptic version.[4] According to Fenwick, UrBAS had its origins in Cappadocia, where it was used and ultimately expanded by Basil of Caesarea himself into what was to become ByzBAS. Similarly, Fenwick concludes that the Jerusalem anaphora called *St. James* was the result of an early conflation between the anaphora described by Cyril of Jerusalem in MC V and this UrBAS, a conflation perhaps accomplished initially by Cyril himself.

Because of its rather simple forms of the institution narrative and epiclesis (with no 'change' in the gifts requested), EgBAS, in its Sahidic Coptic version, is generally viewed as reflecting a late-third or early-fourth century West Syrian (Cappadocian) anaphora. But if this anaphora had its origins somewhere in the West Syrian tradition, it is also true that it has been Egyptianized to some extent. The institution narrative, for example, is attached to the prayer by the common Egyptian connecting link of 'for' or 'because'. And the offering verb in the anamnesis has the characteristic Egyptian aorist tense (i.e., 'we . . . have set forth before you . . . this bread and this cup'), called by Alphonse Raes, 'the famous aorist'.[5]

How and when this West Syrian-type anaphora entered the Egyptian liturgical tradition, and why the name of Basil is attached to this Egyptian version in the first place, is explained by Fenwick in the following manner:

> 'St. Basil's only known visit to Egypt was in 356-357 when . . . he spent some time not only in Alexandria but in looking at Coptic monasteries in Lower Egypt. However, at the time of that visit Basil was still a layman and unlikely to have been concerned with the rewriting of eucharistic prayers. On the other hand, links may well have been forged, and as Basil grew in prestige as a champion of monasticism, it is not unlikely that he was visited by Egyptian ascetics who took back to Egypt with them the anaphora that the saint was using.'[6]

[1] For English text see PEER, pp.67-73.
[2] See *Ibid.*, pp.114-123.
[3] See above, p.5, note 3.
[4] The earliest Coptic version, the Sahidic, with a Latin translation appears in J. Doresse and E. Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de saint Basile* (Louvain, 1960).
[5] A. Raes, 'Un nouveau document de la Liturgie de S. Basile', OCP 26 (1960), pp.403-404.
[6] Fenwick, *Basil and James*, p.305.

The presence of such an anaphora within fourth-century Egypt could go a long way toward explaining generally what Talley has called the West Syrian influence on the Alexandrian anaphoral structure 'from sanctus to final doxology'. In particular, the presence of some form of BAS might explain the curious structure of the SAR anaphora where the bulk of his intercessions occurs in the West Syrian position after the second epiclesis.[1] Thmuis, after all, is in Lower Egypt and the date of Basil's visit is roughly the same as the traditional date assigned to SAR. But this, as well as Fenwick's explanation, in the final analysis, are pure conjectures with no hard evidence in support of them. And, it should be noted, not all scholars have accepted the Cappadocian or West Syrian origins of BAS. As Bradshaw has recently written: 'the possibility cannot be excluded that the prayer is in fact of Egyptian origin—maybe even actually composed in Sahidic and not Greek—and was later exported to other parts of the East, perhaps through Basil's own agency.'[2] The possibility exists, therefore, that either the early Egyptian liturgical tradition knew more than one way to build an anaphora or that, as Raes himself suggested, portions of what was to become EgBAS have their origins not in Cappadocia at all but within the Egyptian tradition itself.[3]

THE POSTANAPHORAL RITES

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the attempt to describe the evolution of the postanaphoral rites in the early Egyptian eucharistic liturgy is frustrated by many of the same problems encountered in the discussion of the preanaphoral rites. And again, apart from the problematic SAR 2-6, nothing is known of the structure and contents of the postanaphora in Egypt before the middle of the fourth century. The fully-developed liturgies of both CMARK and GMARK have the following postanaphoral structures but, as in the preanaphoral rites, it is difficult to know with certainty how early they achieved these particular forms.

CMARK[4]	GMARK[5]
The Fraction and the Lord's Prayer	Prayer of the Lord's Prayer
The Inclination (ascribed to John of Bostra, d. 650)	Prayer of Inclination
The Elevation, Consignation, Commixture (with the invitation to communion, '*Ta hagia tois hagiois*' and response)	The Elevation (with the invitation to communion, '*Ta hagia tois hagiois*' and response)
	The Fraction
The Communion	The Communion
Thanksgiving Prayer	Thanksgiving Prayer
The Inclination (ascribed to John of Bostra)	Prayer behind the Ambo and the Dismissal
The Dismissal	

While some of the particular prayers and ritual actions in these Coptic and Greek rites certainly are later additions to an earlier rite (e.g., those prayers ascribed to John of Bostra in CMARK and actions such as consignation and commixture), there is no reason to conclude that the Egyptian postanaphora had not reached this structural form by *c.* 451.

But how much of this was in place earlier? The invitation to communion, '*Ta hagia tois hagiois*', and an early christological form of its response (i.e., 'One holy, one Lord, Jesus

[1] Cf. Mazza's suggestion (in 'L'anaphora', pp.520-523) that SAR represents fidelity to the 'Alexandrian' type in the preface and sanctus but shifts to the 'Antiochene' type for the rest of his prayer.
[2] Bradshaw, *Search*, p.120.
[3] A. Raes, 'Un nouveau document', pp.401-410.
[4] LEW, pp.180-188.
[5] Cuming, *St Mark*, pp.50-61 and 137-146.

Christ . . . ') is attested already by Didymus the Blind in the late fourth century (*De Trinitate* 2. 6-7; and 3. 10, 16, 23).[1] Similarly SAR 2-6, without any indication of this invitation to communion, display some important structural parallels from the middle of the fourth century. SAR 2 ('The Fraction after the Prayer and the Prayer in the Fraction'), 3 ('Laying on of Hands of the People After the Distribution of the Fraction to the Clergy'), 4 ('Prayer After the Distribution of the People'), and 6 ('Laying on of Hands after the Blessing of Water and Oil')[2] certainly correspond generally to the postanaphoral order of CMARK. The location of the fraction immediately after the anaphora[3] in SAR lends support to Cuming's hypothesis that 'the Coptic rite may be original in performing the Fraction before the Lord's Prayer.'[4] And Prayers 3, 4, and 6 clearly parallel prayers of inclination before communion (3)[5], prayers of thanksgiving after communion (4), and final prayers of inclination and dismissal (6) in both CMARK and GMARK. Again, if the traditional date and provenance for SAR are accepted, the fully-developed postanaphoral rites we see in CMARK and GMARK were well on the way toward their final shape by the middle of the fourth century.

Whatever the shape of the Egyptian postanaphoral rites may have been prior to the witness of SAR, Franz Van de Paverd has stated that at an earlier stage of liturgical development in general 'a piece of bread [would have been] broken off for each individual communicant so that for all practical purposes the fraction [would have taken] place during communion.'[6] And, in relation to this, Taft writes that:

> 'First, the main celebrant at the altar broke off particles for himself and his fellow ministers. Then the gifts were brought out and a piece was broken off and placed in the hand of each communicant as he or she approached in the communion procession. *Communion is still given in this way in the Coptic Orthodox service.*'[7]

Such a ritual structure not only appears to be presupposed for the early Egyptian communion rite by the titles of SAR 2, 3, and 4, but the fact that this structure has remained in Coptic Orthodox usage up to the present day is highly suggestive. Just as the current

[1] On this invitation to communion see R. Taft, '"Holy Things for the Saints": The Ancient Call to Communion and Its Response' in G. Austin (ed.), *Fountain of Life. In Memory of Niels K. Rasmussen, O.P.* (The Pastoral Press: Washington D.C., 1991), pp.87-102.

[2] SAR 5 ('Prayer for the Offering of Oils and Waters') has no parallel in later Egyptian sources but its presence in the postanaphora is certainly consistent with the location of such prayers in the eucharistic liturgies elsewhere. Cf. AT 5, CH 3, TD 3.

[3] Brightman, 'Sacramentary', pp.97-98, suggests that 'the Prayer' referred to in the title of SAR 2 may have been the Lord's Prayer rather than the anaphora. Since we do not know when the Lord's Prayer itself entered the Egyptian eucharistic liturgy, there is no way to confirm this. In any event, while some extant Egyptian eucharistic liturgies do place the fraction immediately after the anaphora, none have it immediately after the Lord's Prayer.

[4] Cuming, *St Mark*, p.142. Although SAR 2 is called the 'Prayer in the Fraction,' Taft, ('Melismos and Comminution: The Fraction and its Symbolism in the Byzantine Tradition,' (hereafter 'Melismos'), *Studia Anselmiana* 95 (Rome 1988), p.541) has noted that 'it is a prayer of preparation for communion' and that its relation to the fraction 'is one of purely physical juxtaposition.' In other words, this prayer is not related to a *symbolic* fraction distinct from the breaking of bread for communion distribution, a distinction found only later when other ritual acts (e.g., consignation and commixture) bring about a separation between a 'symbolic' and a 'practical' breaking of bread.

[5] On the possible origins of this prayer in SAR as a *dismissal* for non-communicants, rather than a prayer of preparation for communion, see Taft, 'Inclination Prayer', pp.38-39.

[6] Van de Paverd, as quoted by Taft, 'Melismos', p.539.

[7] Taft, 'Melismos', p. 539 [Emphasis added]. See also *Idem.*, 'Receiving Communion—A Forgotten Symbol?' in BEW, pp.101-109.

Coptic Orthodox prohibition of baptisms between Palm Sunday and Pentecost may suggest the remnant of an earlier non-paschal theology and ritualization of Christian initiation in Egypt, so also contemporary Coptic eucharistic practice, which essentially keeps 'fraction' and 'communion distribution' together, may be an important link enabling us to have a glimpse of the early Egyptian eucharistic tradition.

CONCLUSION

Any conclusions about the overall shape of the early Egyptian eucharistic liturgy are and must remain tentative. We simply do not have enough evidence to be able to do any more than suggest certain possibilities for what that shape may have been. Indeed, on the basis of that slim evidence, about all that can be said is that the pre- and postanaphoral rites in the early Egyptian tradition looked similar to what we see developing elsewhere in early Christianity. That is, whatever the earliest shape of these rites may have been in Egypt, they, as in the rites of Syria, soon developed with similar kinds of formalized prayers and litanies of intercession, prayers surrounding the Scripture readings, dismissal rites for various categories of people, and formalized prayers surrounding the preparation for and distribution of communion. And in this context, the so-called 'preanaphoral' and the postanaphoral prayers of SAR in the mid-fourth century may well be authentic witnesses to what, at least in one local Egyptian rite, was an early stage in this development.

Regarding the anaphoral tradition we are on more solid ground. The nature and structure, especially of the preface, sanctus, and (first) epiclesis, present us with a model of anaphoral style and development quite distinct from that which developed elsewhere in Christian antiquity. And although EgBAS with its West Syrian-type structure became the normative anaphora in Coptic Orthodoxy, the anaphoral structure reflected by both CMARK and GMARK strongly reminds us of an early, unique, and indigenous pattern of eucharistic praying characteristic of the Egyptian tradition, a pattern perhaps having roots as old as the second century (cf. the *Strasbourg papyrus*) and a pattern, which, as a result of later (but not much later) development, may have ultimately 'given' (at least the *idea* of[1]) the anaphoral sanctus to the rest of the Christian world.

[1] Taft, 'Interpolation II', OCP 58 (1992), p.118. But see above, p.25, note 1.

3. Orders, Hours, and The Liturgical Year

The special character and liturgical structures of the rites of Christian initiation and the eucharistic liturgy with its anaphora in the early Egyptian liturgical tradition are matched by similar unique elements in the areas of ordination, the liturgy of the hours (or divine office), and the liturgical year. In particular, this chapter will discuss the evolution of ordained leadership, the nature of what has been called the cathedral and monastic traditions of the divine office, and, together with the post-Epiphany, forty day, pre-baptismal preparation period already noted in relationship to initiation above[1], the development and wider influence of the Egyptian liturgical year. In relation to both orders and to portions of the liturgical year, it will be seen that the Council of Nicea (A.D. 325) and its aftermath played a rather significant role.

ORDERS

It is extremely difficult to reconstruct the origins and early evolution of the rites of ordination as celebrated in the Coptic Orthodox Church today.[2] Not only do the earliest Coptic manuscripts of these rites date to the fourteenth century, but, as Paul Bradshaw has recently noted, the prayers themselves (i.e., for readers, subdeacons, deacons, presbyters, abbots, archdeacons and bishops, as well as special prayers for metropolitans and the consecration of the patriarch) 'display no obvious affinity to those of the *Canons of Hippolytus* or the *Sacramentary of Sarapion*, but instead . . . closely parallel those in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and are supplemented by material derived chiefly from the Jacobite rites.'[3] Exactly when and how these ordination prayers were adapted by the Coptic Church from AC and other sources, or if they actually reflect, at least in part, a traditional Alexandrian usage, cannot be known and remain the subject of scholarly debate today.[4]

For earlier Egyptian rites of ordination, however, rites which probably reflect local Egyptian rather than specifically Alexandrian usages, we are led again to consider both CH 2-9 and SAR 12-14. Like its principal source, AT, CH provides ordination rites only for bishops, presbyters, and deacons and gives directions for the appointment—but not ordination—of readers, subdeacons, and widows. Of these rites, the ordination prayer for bishops (CH 3) is merely an adaptation of AT 3-6, while the prayer for deacons (CH 5) displays no obvious dependency on AT 8, choosing instead to relate the deacon's ministry to that of 'Stephen and his companions' and focussing strongly on the exemplary moral character of the deacon's life and ministry.

> *CH 3*: O God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all comfort, dwelling on high and looking upon the lowly, knowing everything before it comes to pass, you who have fixed the boundaries of the Church, who have decreed from Adam that there should exist a righteous race—by the intermediary of this bishop—that is [the race] of great Abraham, who have established authorities and powers, look upon N. with your power and mighty Spirit, which you have given to the holy apostles by our Lord Jesus Christ, your only Son, those who have founded the Church in every place, for the honour and glory of your holy name.

[1] See above, pp.8-10.

[2] For texts of the Coptic ordination rites in English see O. H. E. Burmester, *The Rite of Consecration of the Patriarch of Alexandria* (Cairo, 1960); *idem.*, *Ordination Rites of the Coptic Church* (Cairo, 1985). See also Paul Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches of East and West*, hereafter, *Ordination Rites*, (The Liturgical Press, Pueblo: Collegeville, 1990), pp.140-155.

[3] Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, p.9.

[4] See the references cited by Bradshaw in *Ibid.*, p.9.

Since you know the heart of everyone, make him shepherd your people blamelessly, so that he may be worthy of tending your great and holy flock; make his life higher than [that] of all his people, without dispute; make him envied by reason of his virtue by everyone, accept his prayers and his offerings which he will offer you day and night; and let them be for you a sweet-smelling savour. Give him, Lord, the episcopate, a merciful spirit, and the authority to forgive sins; give him power to loosen every bond of the oppression of demons, to cure the sick and crush Satan under his feet swiftly; through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom be glory to you, with him and the Holy Spirit, to the ages of ages. Amen.[1]

CH 5: O God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we beseech you, pour out your Holy Spirit on N., count him among those who serve you according to all your will like Stephen and his companions; fill him with power and wisdom like Stephen; make him triumph over all the powers of the Devil by the sign of your cross with which you sign him; make his life without sin before all men and an example for many, so that he may save a multitude in the holy Church without shame; and accept all his service; through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom be glory to you, with him and the Holy Spirit, to the ages of ages. Amen.[2]

Although CH 4 does provide directions for the ordination of presbyters, it does not cite any prayer whatsoever but directs that the same one used for bishops also be used—with necessary substitutions—for presbyters. In fact, the rubrical directions of CH 4, with the notable exceptions that bishops alone have the power to ordain and are ritually seated as part of their ordination, are explicit in underscoring the *equality* of bishops and presbyters ('One is to pray over him all the prayer of the bishop, except only the name of the bishop. The presbyter is equal to the bishop in everything . . .'[3]).

SAR 12-14, similarly, are prayers for the ordination of deacons (12), presbyters (13), and the bishop (14), and elsewhere in this collection reference is made to subdeacons, readers, and interpreters as ministers of the church.[4]

SAR 12 (Deacons): Father of the only-begotten, you sent your Son and ordered the events upon the earth. You gave canons and orders to the church for the advantage and salvation of the flocks. You elected bishops and presbyters and deacons for the service of your catholic church. Through your only-begotten you elected the seven deacons and graciously gave your holy Spirit to them. Appoint also this one a deacon of your catholic church. Graciously give him a spirit of knowledge and discernment that he may be able to minister purely and blamelessly in this service in the middle of your people. Through your only-begotten Jesus Christ, through whom (be) to you the glory and the power in holy Spirit both now and to all the ages of ages. Amen.

SAR 13 (Presbyters): Master, God of the heavens, Father of your only-begotten, we extend (our) hand(s) upon this man and we pray that the Spirit of truth may come to him. Graciously give him insight and knowledge and a good heart. Let divine Spirit come to be in him that he might be able to govern your people, to act as an ambassador of your divine words, and to reconcile your people to you, the uncreated God. From the spirit of Moses you graciously gave holy Spirit to the elect ones. Distribute holy Spirit also to this one from the Spirit of the only-begotten for the gift of wisdom and knowledge and right faith, that he may be able to serve you with a pure conscience. Through your only-begotten Jesus Christ, through whom (be) to you the glory and the power in holy Spirit both now and to all the ages of ages. Amen.

---

[1] Bradshaw, *Canons*, pp.12-13.

[2] *Ibid.*, p.14.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp.13-14. According to Bradshaw, p.13, this is the earliest clear allusion to a ritual seating in the ordination of bishops.

[4] See SAR 25.

SAR 14 (Bishop): God of truth, you sent the Lord Jesus for the benefit of the whole world. Through him you elected the apostles, appointing holy bishops from generation to generation. Make this one also a living bishop, a holy bishop of the succession of the apostles, and give to him grace and divine Spirit which you graciously gave to all of your genuine servants and prophets and patriarchs. Make him worthy to shepherd your flock and let him continue blamelessly and without stumbling in the episcopate. Through your only-begotten Jesus Christ, through whom (be) to you the glory and the power in holy Spirit both now and to all the ages of ages. Amen.

Unlike either CH or the Coptic ordination rites the ordination prayers of SAR show no obvious literary dependency upon any extant liturgical source and, therefore, undoubtedly reflect 'a truly independent euchological tradition.'[1] Of particular interest is the focus in SAR 13 upon the governing and teaching or preaching roles of the presbyter: 'Let divine Spirit come to be in him that he might be able to govern[2] your people, to act as an ambassador of your divine words, and to reconcile your people to you.' But, at the same time, SAR 14 couldn't be more explicit in asserting that the bishop stands in apostolic succession ('Make this one also a living bishop of the succession of the apostles'), and has the primary tasks of faithful teaching and leadership (e.g., the references to apostles, prophets, patriarchs, and shepherd) in the community.

The absence of a separate prayer for presbyteral ordination and the reference to presbyteral and episcopal equality in CH 4, combined with the roles assigned to presbyters in SAR 13, are intriguing in relationship to the historical development of orders in the early Egyptian Church. Commenting on the description of the presbyteral office in SAR 13, F.E. Brightman argued that it:

'. . . no doubt points to the conditions of the Egyptian Church, where the multiplication of the episcopate was possibly slow and the development of the parochial system was certainly exceptionally rapid . . . carrying with it the comparative independence and self-sufficiency of the presbyterate.'[3]

And because the fifth-century Byzantine historian Socrates claims that preaching by presbyters was discontinued in fourth-century Alexandria due to the 'disturbance' caused there by Arius,[4] Bradshaw suggests the possibility that SAR 13 may 'have originated before that step was taken.'[5]

Of equal significance in this context are references made by Jerome[6], Severus of El-Asmunein[7], and Eutychius, the tenth-century Melchite patriarch of Alexandria[8], to what appears to have been an early tradition regarding both the presbyteral election and ordination of the Alexandrian patriarch. All three are in agreement that until the time of Alexander (ca. 312)—Arius' own bishop after all—the patriarch of Alexandria was chosen from and ordained by the college of twelve presbyters itself, without the involvement of other bishops!

---

[1] Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, p.46.

[2] Since Bradshaw, *Ibid.*, p.63, translates *oikonomêsai* as 'steward', he concludes that there is in this prayer 'no sense of the presbyterate acting as a collegial governing body'. In G. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968), however, the first meaning cited for this verb is 'to govern', a meaning which certainly suggests that the author of SAR 13 did envision some kind of governing role for presbyters.

[3] Brightman, 'Sacramentary', p.256.

[4] HE 5.22. See also Sozomen, HE 7.19.

[5] Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, p.63.

[6] *Ep. 146.1, ad Evagrium.*

[7] *History* IV and VI (PO 1), pp.207, 383.

[8] *Annales* 332 (PG 111), p.982.

In 1955 Eric Kemp concluded that these sources show 'the survival at Alexandria to a later date than elsewhere of a presbyteral college with episcopal powers, such as some have suggested was usual in the great sees of Christendom in the earliest period.'[1] And, as more recent scholarship has tended to draw similar conclusions about the historical reliability of the witness of Jerome, Severus, and Eutychius[2], it becomes quite plausible to suggest that it is only during the aftermath of the Council of Nicea that this process ultimately changed in Alexandria and throughout Egypt.

Particularly important here are Canons IV and VI of Nicea, which deal, respectively, with both episcopal ordinations and the jurisdictional authority of the Alexandrian patriarch himself in relationship to those ordinations. These Nicene canons read:

> *Canon IV*: It is by all means proper that a bishop should be appointed by all the bishops in the province; but should this be difficult, either on account of urgent necessity or because of distance, three at least should meet together, and the consent of the absent bishops also being given and communicated in writing, then the ordination should take place. But in every province the ratification of what is done should be left to the Metropolitan.[3]
>
> *Canon VI*: Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis prevail, that the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction in all these, since the like is customary for the Bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the Churches retain their privileges. And this is to be universally understood, that if any one be made bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan, the great Synod has declared that such a man ought not to be a bishop. If, however, two or three bishops shall from natural love of contradiction, oppose the common suffrage of the rest, it being reasonable and in accordance with the ecclesiastical law, then let the choice of the majority prevail.[4]

According to C. Wilfrid Griggs, the aftermath of the Council of Nicea, reflected in these canons, brought about significant changes for Egyptian ecclesiastical practices and structures. Indeed, Griggs concludes that '. . . by placing the authority for episcopal succession in Egypt in the hands of the Alexandrian bishop, Canons IV and VI of Nicaea would effectively replace the tradition of immediate selection and ordination in local churches'[5]—a tradition which until then had been presbyteral in authority and style.

To this same overall Nicene context probably belongs also SAR 14 for the ordination of the bishop. On literary, liturgical, and theological grounds, I have argued elsewhere[6] that Prayers 13 and 14 actually may belong to two different strata in SAR. That is, SAR 13 possibly belongs to an earlier, perhaps third-century Egyptian tradition, where the focus on the presbyterate was central and the *act* of ordination was, essentially, a prayer for the gifts needed by the candidate to fill the office. But SAR 14, with its heavy emphasis upon episcopal apostolic succession and its request that God might *make* the candidate a bishop, appears to reflect a development later than this. Such a development would be consistent

---

[1] Eric Kemp, 'Bishops and Presbyters at Alexandria,' in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 6 (1955), p.140.

[2] See A. Vilela, *La condition collegiale des prêtres au IIIe siècle*, hereafter, *La condition collegiale*, (Beauchesne, Paris, 1971), pp.173-179, especially the extensive bibliography provided on p.174, note 5; and Tim Vivian, *Saint Peter of Alexandria: Bishop and Martyr*, Studies in Antiquity & Christianity (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1988), pp.12-15, 47-49.

[3] ET from from NPNF, ser. 2, vol. XIV, p.11

[4] ET from NPNF, ser. 2, vol. XIV, p.15.

[5] Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity* , p.132.

[6] See Chapter III of *Prayers*.

with: (1) changes in the perception of the *rite* of ordination;[1] (2) the nature of episcopal and patriarchal authority, underscored by Canons IV and VI of Nicea; and (3) especially within the Egyptian Church, the continued threats of schism and heresy (e.g., Melitianism, Arianism, Semi-Arianism, and Manichaeism). Bradshaw has drawn similar attention to this prayer and has suggested, in fact, that its focus on apostolic succession, together with other elements, may point to its 'origin in a community that was troubled by heresy and hence saw the bishop primarily as the guardian of true apostolic tradition, a development . . . not previously encountered in ordination euchology.'[2]

If contemporary scholars are correct in assuming that the earlier Egyptian tradition had emphasized the authoritative governing role of the presbyterate and presbyteral leadership in episcopal ordinations, then the absence of a separate prayer in CH 4 for presbyters[3] and the focus on the role of presbyters in SAR 13 well may reflect liturgically the memory of this practice within the Egyptian Christian tradition. And, in this way, the possible clues present in the extant liturgical texts, together with the evidence suggested by the other sources noted above, contribute to making the evolution of ordination in Egypt an important witness to what many have considered to be an early practice elsewhere (e.g., Rome and Corinth).[4] That is, what the Egyptian sources remember is an earlier style of presbyteral-episcopacy, a style which, while elsewhere developing more rapidly into the monarchical episcopacy[5], still remained a force in Egypt until the immediate aftermath of Nicea.

HOURS

Third-Century Witnesses

The earliest references to what appear to be fixed times for daily prayer in the Egyptian tradition appear in the third-century writings of both Clement of Alexandria and Origen:

> (Clement, *Stromateis* 7.7): 'Now we are commanded to reverence and to honour the same one, being persuaded that He is Word, Saviour, and Leader, and by Him, the Father, not on special days, as some others, but doing this continually in our whole life, and in every way. Certainly the elect race justified by the precept says, "Seven times a day have I praised Thee." Whence not in a specified place, or selected temple, or at certain festivals and on appointed days, but during his whole life, the Gnostic in every place, even if he be alone by himself, and wherever he has any of those who have exercised the life faith, honours God, that is, acknowledges his gratitude for the knowledge of the way to live . . . .
>
> . . . Now, if some assign definite hours for prayer — as, for example, *the third, and sixth, and ninth* — yet the Gnostic prays throughout his whole life, endeavouring by prayer to have fellowship with God. And, briefly, having reached to this, he leaves behind him all that is of no service, as having now received the perfection of the man that acts by love. But the distribution of the hours into a threefold division, honoured with as many prayers, those are acquainted with, who know the blessed triad of the holy abodes . . . .

[1] On the changes within the interpretation of early ordination rites from prayer for the needed gifts to perceiving the ordination prayer as that which 'bestows' the office, see Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, pp.21-23.

[2] *Ibid.*, p.50.

[3] On this see Vilela, *La condition collegiale*, p.176.

[4] See *Ibid.*, p.178.

[5] For a helpful recent summary of the evolution of the monarchical episcopacy in general, see J. Baldovin, 'The Development of the Monarchical Bishop to 250 A.D.' in *Idem.*, *Worship: City, Church, and Renewal* (The Pastoral Press, Washington, D.C., 1991), pp.151-170.

. . . Accordingly the Gnostic will pray along with those who have more recently believed, for those things in respect of which it is their duty to act together. And his whole life is a holy festival. His sacrifices are prayers, and praises, and readings in the Scriptures before meals, and psalms and hymns during meals and before bed, and *prayers also again during the night*. By these he unites himself to the divine choir, from continual recollection, engaged in contemplation which has everlasting remembrance.'[1]
(Clement, *Stromateis* 7.12): 'He, all day and night, speaking and doing the Lord's commands, rejoices exceedingly, not only on *rising in the morning and at noon*, but also when walking about, when asleep, when dressing and undressing . . . '[2]
(Origen, *On Prayer* XII.2): 'And he prays "constantly" (deeds of virtue or fulfilling the commandments are included as part of prayer) who unites prayer with the deeds required and right deeds with prayer. For the only way we can accept the command to "pray constantly' (1 Thess. 5.17) as referring to a real possibility is by saying that the entire life of the saint taken as a whole is a single great prayer. What is customarily called prayer is, then, a part of this prayer. Now prayer in the ordinary sense ought to be made no less than *three times each day*. This is evident from the story of Daniel, who prayed three times a day when such great peril had been devised for him (Dan. 6.13). And Peter went up to the housetop about the sixth hour to pray; that is when he saw the sheet descending from heaven let down by four corners (Acts 10.9, 11). He was offering the middle prayer of the three, the one referred to before him by David, "In the morning may you hear my prayer, in the morning I will offer to you and I will watch" (Ps. 5.3). And the last time of prayer is indicated by "The lifting up of my hands is an evening sacrifice" (Ps. 141.2). Indeed, we do not even complete the *night-time* properly without that prayer of which David speaks when says, "At midnight I rise to praise you because of your righteous ordinances" (Ps. 119.62). And Paul, as it says in the Acts of the Apostles, prayed "about midnight" with Silas in Philippi and sang a hymn to God so that even the prisoners heard them (Acts 16:25).'[3]

Until quite recently, the way in which Clement and Origen were interpreted here has been influenced by the classic and influential study of C.W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*. Dugmore argued that Clement's reference to prayer specifically at the third, sixth, and ninth hours was to be viewed as early evidence for the existence of what was to become the 'little hours' of terce, sext, and none prayed privately by individuals. These hours, Dugmore held, were kept in addition to what he believed were daily public gatherings for communal morning and evening prayer, a pattern in continuity with 'traditional' synagogue practice.[4]

Bradshaw, however, rejecting Dugmore's claims about the 'little hours,' the existence of daily morning and evening prayer in the synagogue, and the 'public' dimension of *Christian* morning and evening prayer in this era, argues, alternatively, that both Clement and Origen are witnesses, instead, to a *three-fold pattern* of daily prayer. That is, both point to a daily practice of morning, noon, and evening prayer, together with prayer again at some point during the night.[5] And, even though Clement does refer specifically to 'some' who

[1] ET from ANF, II, pp.532-537 [emphasis added].
[2] *Ibid.*, p.546 [emphasis added].
[3] ET from *Origen*, trans. and introduced by R. A. Greer, *Classics of Western Spirituality* (Paulist Press: New York, 1979), pp.104-105 [emphasis added].
[4] C. W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (ACC 45, London, 1964), pp.67-68.
[5] Bradshaw, *Daily Prayer*, pp.47-50. See also *idem.*, *Search*, pp.190-191.

pray at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, Bradshaw suggests further, following an hypothesis first offered by L. Edward Phillips[1], that such a pattern may reflect merely an alternate three-fold pattern of daily prayer modelled on the divisions of the day in the Roman Empire rather than upon the natural rhythm of morning, noon, and evening.[2]

In any event, such a three-fold pattern for prayer—rather than that of morning and evening alone as in Dugmore's approach—seems to be in much closer continuity with some forms of Jewish practice in the first century, where a similar three-fold structure was known.[3] Furthermore, that this pattern should appear precisely in the sources of early Christian *Egypt* is really no surprise at all when one considers the compelling theory of Colin Roberts that there was a firm link between early Egyptian Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism at Alexandria in the late first and early second centuries, especially since, according to Roberts, 'Christianity reached Egypt from Palestine in a form strongly influenced by Judaism' in the first place.[4]

Whatever the ultimate reliability of Clement and Origen may be in regard to a fixed horarium of daily prayer in third-century Egypt (and here should be noted the caveat of Taft that their references *may* be nothing more than 'another way of saying "pray always," like our expression "morning, noon, and night"'[5]), the specific type (e.g., individual or communal) and content of that prayer are even more difficult to determine. Bradshaw writes that:

> ' . . . from the allusions made by ancient writers it would seem that third-century Christians maintained the character, if not the form, of prayer reflected in New Testament documents, and especially the Pauline Epistles, and derived ultimately from Judaism, of praise and thanksgiving leading to petition and intercession for others. Such prayer seems generally to have been offered either by individuals on their own or by small groups of family and friends and not in formal liturgical assemblies, which appear to have been limited to the celebration of the eucharist on Sundays, to services of the word at the ninth hour on Wednesdays and Fridays, and to the agape, the occasional communal supper of a local congregation.'[6]

And, although it appears that neither psalmody nor the reading of the Bible were integral parts of this horarium (with psalmody in this early period generally reserved for the agape), it may be significant that both Clement and Origen do interpret the meaning of daily prayer with reference to select psalms. Indeed, Clement of Alexandria, referring to orientation in prayer, is our earliest witness to what will become a constitutive and fixed element of evening prayer in what has been called the 'cathedral office' in both East and West, namely, Psalm 141. In *Stromateis* 7.7 Clement writes:

> . . . since the dawn is an image of the day of birth, and from that point the light which has shone forth from the darkness increases, there has also dawned on those involved

[1] L. E. Phillips, 'Daily Prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus', in *Journal of Theological Studies* 40 (1989), pp.389-400.

[2] Bradshaw, *Search*, p.191.

[3] See Bradshaw, *Daily Prayer*, pp.8ff.

[4] C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript*, pp.49ff. See also R. Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office and its Meaning for Today* , hereafter, *Hours*, (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN, 1986), pp.16-17.

[5] *Ibid.*, p.17.

[6] P. Bradshaw, 'Cathedral vs. Monastery: The Only Alternatives for the Liturgy of the Hours?' hereafter, 'Cathedral vs. Monastery', in J. Neil Alexander, *Time and Community: In Honor of Thomas Julian Talley* (The Pastoral Press: Washington, D.C., 1990), p. 125. See also Bradshaw, *Daily Prayer*, pp.23-46.

in darkness a day of the knowledge of truth. In correspondence with the manner of the sun's rising, prayers are made looking towards the sunrise in the east. Whence also the most ancient temple looked towards the west, that people might be taught to turn to the east when facing the images. "Let my prayer be directed before thee as incense, the uplifting of my hands as the evening sacrifice," say the Psalms.[1]

Because Clement refers here both to sunrise and to the 'evening sacrifice' of Psalm 141.2 it is possible that he is alluding to morning and evening prayer. And, because Psalm 141.2 appears again in Origen (*On Prayer* XII.2) as, in fact, the biblical warrant for prayer in the evening, it is quite possible that this particular psalm was already becoming a part of the content of Egyptian evening prayer in the third century.[2]

Fourth-Century Developments: Cathedral and Monastic

Our understanding of the evolution of what Anton Baumstark termed the 'cathedral' and 'monastic'[3] traditions of the Hours in the fourth century and beyond has increased dramatically in recent years. Thanks, in large part, to the, already noted, ground-breaking studies of Taft and Bradshaw we now have a much clearer picture of the common elements in the various forms of the Hours throughout the Christian world of late antiquity and how certain traditions influenced others resulting in a new appreciation for the variety and diversity of prayer forms in the early Church overall. With specific regard to Egypt, it is the development and wider influence of what has been called the 'desert monastic office' where contemporary scholarship has further nuanced and advanced traditional hypotheses and approaches. But concerning the Egyptian 'cathedral office' we still know far too little. For this, the extant sources again are very few and the ones we do have only give us general descriptions without providing much by way of the kinds of explicit details we wish we had.

In particular, the sources for the 'cathedral office' in fourth-century Egypt tend to be limited to brief references to occasional all-night vigils, with the responsorial use of Psalm 136 explicitly noted, in the writings of Athanasius (*Defence of His Flight* 24 and *History of the Arians* 81), a tradition confirmed by both Socrates and Sozomen in their respective *Church Histories*, a reference to morning prayer outside of a monastic context in Cassian's *Conferences* (21), exhortations to follow an horarium of prayer—either at church or in private—at dawn, cockcrow, at evening, and in the middle of the night in CH (21, 26, and 27), and a reference to a daily practice at church of both morning and evening prayer in Paphnutius' late fourth-century *History of the Monks of the Egyptian Desert*.[4] Although minimal information about the content of this 'cathedral office' is provided by these documents (i.e., prayers and psalms), there is one element of special significance that stands out, namely, the reading of Scripture lessons.

Generally speaking, the 'cathedral office' throughout the fourth-century Christian world, as defined by Baumstark, Juan Mateos[5], and others, was a popular type of ecclesial liturgy celebrated in the morning and evening, presided over by the bishop with the assistance of numerous other ministers. Along with this diversity of ministries, its common character-

[1] ET from ANF II, p.535.

[2] On this see G. Winkler, 'Über die Kathedralvesper in den verschiedenen Riten des Ostens und Westens,' (hereafter 'Über die Kathedralvesper'), in *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 16 (1974), p. 81.

[3] A. Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy* (London, 1958), pp.111ff.

[4] For pertinent texts and references see Taft, *Hours*, pp.34-36, and 167, upon which I am dependent in this section.

[5] See his 'The Origins of the Divine Office' in *Worship* 41 (1967), pp.477-485.

istics also included the *select* use of psalmody (i.e., at least Psalms 148-150 as the core of morning prayer and Psalm 141 in the evening), ceremonies and symbols (e.g., incense and light), and chant and hymnody. Most often understood as a liturgy of praise and intercession, it was not a 'Liturgy of the Word' (i.e., not a 'preaching' office) and, as such, the reading of Scripture lessons did not normally occur except, as Taft notes, in both Cappadocia and Egypt.[1] But in Egypt this element seems to have been especially important, so important, in fact, that CH 27 states explicitly that: 'Each day when there is no prayer in church, take a Bible and read from it. Let the sun see the Bible on your knees at each dawn.'[2] And, similarly, CH 21 says: 'The presbyters are to assemble each day at the church, and the deacons, the subdeacons, the readers, and all the people at the time when the cock crows. They are to perform the prayer, the psalms and the *reading of Scripture* and the prayers . . . '[3]

Neither prayer texts nor specific evidence for the inclusion of such elements as Psalms 148-150 for morning prayer or Psalm 141 for evening prayer exist in the extant Egyptian sources from this period. Nevertheless, Taft points to remnants of the cathedral offices of morning prayer and vigils in the horarium of the Coptic Orthodox Church today, where in occasional offices called 'Psalmodia of the Evening' (celebrated after compline) and 'Psalmodia of the Night' (celebrated before morning prayer) Psalms 148-150 and Psalm 136, the same vigil psalm referred to by Athanasius above, regularly occur.[4] Similarly, in her exhaustive analysis of cathedral vespers in East and West, Gabriele Winkler has shown that in the *festal* office of vespers in the *Horologion* of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church—a liturgical tradition rooted in Egyptian Christianity, after all—Psalm 141 remains as a fixed and central element.[5] And, given the reference to this psalm already in the writings of Clement and Origen, it would not be unreasonable to assume that Ethiopian cathedral vespers give us a picture of what was once traditional in Egypt as well.

Together with these remnants identified by Taft and Winkler, I should like to suggest further that at least some of SAR 19-30 might also provide, in part, a picture of the fourth-century cathedral office in Egypt. If my above-noted hypothesis is correct—that SAR 19-30 are merely part of a *collection* of prayers from which one might make a selection on various occasions[6]—then certainly the office would be one highly appropriate occasion for the use of such prayers. Indeed, not only is there a general correspondence between the title of SAR 19 ('First Prayer of the Lord's Day') and that of the beginning of Coptic morning prayer ('First Prayer of the Day')[7], but the different categories of people for whom intercession is made in these prayers (e.g., catechumens, the sick, rulers, the clergy, the departed, and the Church and its members in general) together with what appear to be

---

[1] Taft, *Hours*, pp.32-33.

[2] Bradshaw, *Canons*, p.29. Because of the prohibitive high cost in providing Bibles and the low literacy level of new converts, however, Bradshaw suggests that such an individual practice referred to in this canon would have been possible only for a very few elite members of the community. See his 'Cathedral vs. Monastery', p.126.

[3] Bradshaw, *Canons*, p.26 [emphasis added].

[4] Taft, *Hours*, pp.253ff.

[5] Winkler, 'Über die Kathedralvesper,' pp.82-83. For additional remnants of Psalm 141 in Coptic Orthodox liturgical rites (including the 'Offering of Incense' on both the evening and morning before the eucharistic liturgy and the office of vespers during the 'Fast of Nineveh'), which, according to Winkler, also point to traditional Egyptian usage of Psalm 141 in the cathedral office, see pp.81-82.

[6] See above, p.19.

[7] On this see J.-M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus*, III (Rome, 1930), p.38. For the text of this Coptic prayer itself see O. H. E. Burmester, *The Egyptian or Coptic Church* (Cairo 1967), pp.96ff.

dismissals of various types are precisely the kinds of elements present in other contemporary non-Egyptian texts (e.g., in AC VIII.36ff. and Egeria's description of the Jerusalem office) which are considered to be *classic* sources for the cathedral office of the fourth century in general. And since Scripture reading was a part of the early Egyptian cathedral office, then even SAR 20, 'Prayer After the Standing Up from the Homily', might not be inappropriate in such a context. There is, of course, no absolute proof that SAR 19-30 were ever used for the cathedral office, but when the equally unprovable theory of their exclusive preanaphoral use is likewise noted, the possibility of their liturgical use in the office becomes a quite reasonable conjecture.

Although the cathedral office of the early Egyptian tradition, because of the presence of Scripture readings, proves to be one exception to the standard definition of the cathedral office overall, it is the Egyptian monastic office which has actually defined the category of 'monastic office' altogether. As noted at the beginning of this study[1], our major source for the fourth-century Egyptian monastic office is the *Institutes* (especially Books II and III) of John Cassian, himself a monk from Gaul, who during the last two decades of the fourth century lived in the great monastic center of Scetis in Lower Egypt. According to Cassian, the 'prescribed system' of daily monastic prayer which he had experienced at Scetis was universal 'throughout the whole of Egypt and the Thebaid'[2] (that is, in both Lower and Upper Egypt). He writes:

> ' . . . The number of Psalms is fixed at twelve both at Vespers and in the office of Nocturns, in such a way that at the close two lessons follow, one from the Old and the other from the New Testament. And this arrangement, fixed ever so long ago, has continued unbroken to the present day throughout so many ages, in all the monasteries of those districts, because it is said that it was no appointment of man's invention, but was brought down from heaven to the fathers by the ministry of an angel . . .
>
> . . . [For] when in different degrees they [i.e., the monks] strove, each according to his own powers, to fix an enormous number of Psalms, and some were for fifty, others sixty, and some not content with this number, thought that they actually ought to go beyond it—there was such a holy difference of opinion in their pious discussion on the rule of their religion that the time for their Vesper office came before the sacred question was decided; and, as they were going to celebrate their daily rites and prayers, one rose up in the midst to chant the Psalms to the Lord. And while they were all sitting (as is still the custom in Egypt), with their minds intently fixed on the words of the chanter, when he had sung eleven Psalms, separated by prayers introduced between them, verse after verse being evenly enunciated, he finished the twelfth with a response of Alleluia, and then, by his sudden disappearance from the eyes of all, put an end at once to their discussion and their service . . .
>
> . . . Whereupon the venerable assembly of the Fathers understood that by Divine Providence a general rule had been fixed for the congregations of the brethren thorugh the angel's direction, and so decreed that this number should be preserved both in their evening and in their noctural services; and when they added to these two lessons, one from the Old and one from the New Testament, they added them simply as extras and of their own appointment, only for those who liked, and who were to gain by constant study a mind well stored with Holy Scripture. But on Saturday and Sunday they read them both from the New Testament; viz., one from the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles, and one from the Gospel. And this also those do whose concern is the reading and the recollection of the Scriptures, from Easter to Whitsuntide.[3]

[1] See above, page 6.
[2] *Institutes* II.3. ET from NPNF, series 2, vol. 11, p.205.
[3] *Institutes* II.4-6. ET from NPNF, series 2, vol. 11, pp.206-207.

In this same context Cassian also provides pertinent information on the manner in which these two offices of early morning[1] and evening prayer were conducted. According to him, each of the twelve psalms was recited slowly and deliberately by a soloist or cantor, while the monks sat in common meditation and reflection on the text being recited. At the conclusion of each psalm the monks stood for silent prayer and then prostrated themselves upon the ground until the superior prayed the concluding collect. Only at the conclusion of the twelfth psalm, with its alleluia refrain, was there added—a single time—the short doxology of the *Gloria Patri*.[2] And, contrary to the cathedral practice of select psalmody for morning and evening prayer, Cassian notes that the psalms of the monastic office followed the pattern of what is often termed either *lectio continua* or *currente psalterio*. That is, the psalms were recited simply according to their biblical order, with longer psalms often divided into units, and with no specific correlation to the hour of the day.[3]

While traditional scholarship tended to take Cassian at his word regarding what he claims to be universal Egyptian monastic practice as well as the content and manner of the monastic office he describes,[4] the recent work of Armand Veilleux[5] and Taft, drawing on other available sources, has suggested great caution in evaluating Cassian's description.[6] One of Cassian's primary concerns, as noted previously[7], was the reformation of monastic practice in Gaul along the lines of Egyptian monasticism. Some of what he says about the practices of Scetis in Lower Egypt, therefore, such as his references to prayers and prostrations between the psalms, seems to be derived instead from what he knew to be the case in Upper Egypt. Similarly, in spite of Cassian's assertion to the contrary,[8] it cannot be assumed that the tradition of Scetis held *daily* communal gatherings for morning and evening prayer in the late fourth century. While this was certainly the case again in the cenobitic type of Pachomian monasticism of Upper Egypt, the tradition of Lower Egypt, firmly rooted in the heremetic model of desert monasticism, knew such communal gatherings for the office *only* on Saturdays and Sundays. The *daily* office among the monks of Lower Egypt, instead, was something recited in the privacy of one's cell either by the solitary monk alone or, on occasion, with guests and/or other companions. And, finally, even Cassian's claim that throughout Egyptian monastic circles both morning and evening prayer consisted of twelve psalms each has been shown to be a later development of an earlier practice. That is, not only is there no evidence for a 'prescribed system' of twelve psalms at morning and evening prayer in the monasteries of Upper Egypt, but the recitation of a total of twenty-four psalms each day appears itself to be based on an earlier 'system' of prayer at *every* hour of the day and night, an early desert Egyptian monastic attempt to fulfill the precept of 1 Thessalonians 5.17 to 'pray without ceasing'. Therefore, Cassian's above reference to the monastic dispute about the proper number of psalms in the office, settled only by what has come to be called the 'Rule of the Angel', reflects a later adaptation or grouping of the twenty-four daily and night time prayers to the morning and evening celebration of the office.[9]

---

[1] Bradshaw's intriguing hypothesis (see *Daily Prayer*, pp.96, 102-110) that Cassian was actually referring here to a monastic nocturnal vigil rather than morning prayer itself is convincingly proven incorrect by Taft (see *Hours*, pp.65, 191ff.), a conclusion with which Bradshaw now also agrees (see 'Cathedral vs. Monastery', p.135, note 14).

[2] See *Institutes*, II.8.

[3] See Ibid., II.11.

[4] Cf. Mateos, 'The Origins of the Divine Office,' pp.482-483.

[5] A. Veilleux, *La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pâchomien au Ive siècle* (Rome 1968).

[6] See Taft, *Hours*, pp.57-73, upon whom I am relying for the following discussion.

[7] See above, p.6.

[8] In addition to *Institutes* II.3, see also III.2.

[9] On this see Taft, *Hours*, p.62.

Nevertheless, there can be no question but that it is the style and spirit of the Egyptian monastic office, held in such high esteem by Cassian, that had a profound impact on the shape of the monastic office elsewhere in Christian antiquity and, thus, must be ranked as one of the most influential contributions of early Egyptian Christian liturgy. Rooted both in the continuous contemplative prayer of Clement of Alexandria's 'true Gnostic,' the theology of Origen, and the great fathers of the Egyptian desert, the Egyptian monastic focus on the sequential recitation of the psalms and the continual meditation on Scripture (whether in common or alone)—together with the generally high view accorded to the Egyptian style of monasticism as the monastic 'ideal' throughout the early Church—often led either to the incorporation of its central elements (e.g., the whole psalter) or to the addition of other complete offices (e.g., more frequent vigils) into the celebration of the hours elsewhere. Indeed, such has been the legacy of the fourth-century Egyptian monastic office that not only is the current liturgy of the hours of the Coptic Orthodox Church the most purely 'monastic' of all offices in East or West,[1] but, as Bradshaw has noted, this early monastic style of prayer 'still continues to shape much of the spirituality of the daily office today' throughout the churches.[2]

LITURGICAL YEAR

Explicit evidence for the shape of the liturgical year in early Christian Egypt is rather minimal and is again limited to a few references scattered throughout the writings of various Egyptian authors of the early centuries. From Clement of Alexandria (*Stromateis* I.21), for example, we do know that, at least in some Egyptian communities, a feast on January 6, claimed by Clement to be the historical date of Christ's birth, already existed in his time as the celebration of the Baptism of Jesus.[3] Both the date and the baptismal content of this feast, of course, have influenced the celebration of Epiphany in the churches of the East from that time through the present day[4], with Christmas itself only adopted in Alexandria within the context of the great christological controversy surrounding the Council of Ephesus (431).[5]

Similarly, references to the annual celebration of Pascha appear in Clement[6] and Origen[7], with explicit references in Origen to both the day of 'preparation' for Pascha and to the fifty-day Easter season of Pentecost. We know from Dionysius of Alexandria's *Letter to Basilides*, 1, that, already in mid-third century Alexandria, Pascha was preceded by a preparatory week-long fast. And, it should be noted, not only was the Alexandrian reckoning of the annual date of Pascha ultimately accepted as normative by the Council of Nicea in its attempt at resolving the various early paschal traditions[8], but Origen's own theologically-motivated translation of 'Pascha' as the 'passage' or 'transitus' of the faithful (*On the*

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp.249-259.

[2] Bradshaw, 'Cathedral vs. Monastery', p.133. Bradshaw's recent book, *Two Ways of Praying* (John Knox Press: Westminster 1994) describes how both 'cathedral' and 'monastic' prayer as styles continue to shape the various experiences of Christian prayer today.

[3] See above, p.7; and Talley, *Year*, pp.117-129.

[4] See Talley, *Year*, pp.121ff.; and J. Neil Alexander, *Waiting for the Coming: The Liturgical Meaning of Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany* (The Pastoral Press: Washington D.C., 1993), pp.72ff.

[5] On this see the classic study of B. Botte, *Les origines de la Noël et de l'Épiphanie* (Louvain, 1932), pp.11-13.

[6] *On the Pascha*, Fragments 25, 25, and 28. For these texts see the excellent anthology compiled by R. Cantalamessa, *Easter in the Early Church* (The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1993), pp.52-53.

[7] *On the Pascha*, 1; *Commentary on John* 10; *Homilies on Exodus* 5.2, 7.4; *Homilies on Numbers* 23.6; *Homilies on Jeremiah* 19.3; and *Against Celsus* 8.22. For these texts see *Ibid.*, pp.53-58.

[8] See *Ibid.*, pp.63-64.

Pascha 1)—rather than the 'passion' of Christ as the central focus of the feast—contributed a particular liturgical theology which still shapes much of contemporary interpretation of and reflection on the paschal triduum today.[1]

Unfortunately, we know nothing about the celebration of saints' feasts in the early Egyptian tradition. Origen (*On Prayer* XIV.6) already knows of prayer *to* the saints (a tradition he considers 'not foolish'), and, if Socrates can be trusted here (HE VII.32)[2], was also the first to use the title *Theotokos* for the virgin Mary. In a letter of Dionysius to Bishop Fabius of Antioch, preserved only in Eusebius of Caesaria (HE VI.41-42), there is contained a list of martyrs who perished during the Decian persecution. And later in this same work (VIII.7-10) Eusebius describes the martyrdom of other Egyptians during the Diocletian persecution, not the least of whom was Phileas, the bishop of Thmuis, whose letter to the Thmuites on martyrdom in Alexandria he also cites. But since no early calendars of commemoration exist for Egypt, and almost none of the martyrs listed in either place by Eusebius appear in the much later Coptic *Synaxarion*[3], we are left with very little to go on for this early period. At the same time, scholars occasionally have drawn attention to what appears to be a unique Alexandrian tradition of dividing the 'Dormition' of Mary on January 21 from her 'Assumption' on August 16 (or 17), a distinction exported into the calendar of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church as well.[4] Since mid-January Marian festivals for either her 'burial' or 'Assumption' appear also in the sources for the Gallican liturgy[5], it is possible that this points to an early tradition. But the development of such festivals—under these particular titles, at least—cannot have pre-dated the Council of Ephesus.

The most important contribution of scholarship concerning the liturgical year in Egypt, of course, has been the recent work of Thomas Talley on the relationship between the post-Epiphany, forty-day, pre-baptismal preparation period (summarized earlier in the context of initiation[6]) and that of the origins and development of the pre-paschal Lent in Christian antiquity. Talley writes that:

> '. . . the Council of Nicea is something of a watershed for the fast of forty days. Prior to Nicea, no record exists of such a forty-day fast before Easter. Only a few years after the council, however, we encounter it in most of the Church as either a well-established custom or one that has become so nearly universal as to impinge on those churches that have not yet adopted it.'[7]

And the origins of that 'well-established' custom, according to him, are to be located precisely in that pre-Nicene, Alexandrian, forty-day, post-Epiphany, pre-baptismal fast presumably alluded to in Origen, Peter of Alexandria, and CH. Therefore, it is this fasting period which ultimately becomes one of the greatest contributions of the Egyptian liturgical tradition to the liturgical cycle of the Church in general.

---

[1] On this see *Ibid.*, pp.11ff. See also *idem.*, *The Mystery of Easter* (The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1993), pp.7-19.

[2] ET in NPNF, series 2, p.171. J. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. II (Utrecht, 1953), p.81, incorrectly cites Sozomen rather than Socrates here.

[3] I. Forget (ed.), *Synaxarium Alexandrinum*, 6 vols. (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, vols. 47-49, 67, 78, 90, Louvain, 1953-1963). See also R.-G. Coquin, 'Le Synaxaire des Coptes, un nouveau témoin de la recension de Haute Égypte' in *Analecta Bollandiana* 95 (1977), pp.351-365; G. Dix, 'The Coptic Calendar' in *Laudate* 17 (1939), pp.56-61; and M. de Fenoyl, *Le sanctoral Copte* (Beyrouth, 1960).

[4] Cf. P. Jounel, 'The Veneration of Mary', in A. G. Martimort, et. al. (eds.) *The Church at Prayer*, vol. IV: *The Liturgy and Time* (The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1986), pp.130ff.

[5] See *Ibid.*, p.137, and M. de Fenoyl (see above note 3), p.117.

[6] See above, pp.8-10.

[7] Talley, *Year*, p.168.

The question, however, is *how* does this Alexandrian tradition, presumably centred on Epiphany, become the universal pre-paschal tradition of Lent? R.-G. Coquin argues that this happened as the result of the Council of Nicea's settlement regarding the calculation to be employed for the annual celebration of Pascha.[1] But closely related to this is the fact that prior to Nicea our evidence for paschal baptism, as demonstrated recently by Bradshaw, is limited to North Africa (Tertullian's *De baptismo* 19) and Rome (Hippolytus' *Commentary on Daniel*).[2] In other words, it is not only that we meet *Lent* as a 'well-established custom' after Nicea, but, in addition, we now encounter a distinct, almost universal, preference for the celebration of baptism itself on Pascha, interpreted along the lines of a Romans 6 paschal theology. But, as we have already seen above[3], this preference was followed everywhere *except* at Alexandria, which, although shifting its forty-day fast to a location immediately before Pascha in order to conform to the rest of the Church, continued to celebrate baptisms at the very *end* of this forty-day period, first on Good Friday, and second (after a later addition of yet another week of fasting attached to the beginning of Lent), on the Friday *before* Holy Week.

In this context it is important to recall that part of Talley's argument centers around the hypothesis that in conjunction with the conferral of baptism on the sixth day of the final week of the fast there was a reading from a lost Gospel of Mark (the *Mar Saba Clementine Fragment*) which, between Mark 10.34 and 10.35, described an initiation of a Lazarus-like figure whom Jesus had raised from the dead six days earlier in Bethany. And in the Markan sequence, of course, the very next chapter describes Jesus' 'Palm Sunday' entrance into Jerusalem. What makes this so significant is the light it may shed on the Lenten liturgical traditions of both Jerusalem and Constantinople. In her late fourth-century pilgrimage diary Egeria refers to a stational liturgy held at the tomb of Lazarus on the Saturday before Palm Sunday.[4] And, more importantly, the *typica* of the tenth-century liturgy of Constantinople reveal a complete *baptismal* liturgy on the same *Lazarus Saturday*[5], where the Markan Lenten sequence of Sunday lectionary readings, culminating in Mark 10.32-45, now ceases, and John 11.1-45, the canonical story of Lazarus, is read, and followed the next day, Palm Sunday, with the Johannine narrative of Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem. If Talley is correct here, then not only does the forty-day *season* of Lent have an Egyptian origin but both the shape of and the lectionary for that season in some other liturgical traditions may also have been derived from Egypt.[6]

---

[1] R.-G. Coquin, 'Une Réforme liturgique du concile de Nicée (325)?' in *Comptes Rendus. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres* (Paris, 1967), pp.178-192.

[2] See P. Bradshaw, '"Diem baptismo sollemniorem": Initiation and Easter in Christian Antiquity', in E. Carr, et. al. (eds.), *EULÔGEMA: Studies in Honor of Robert Taft S.J.* (Rome, 1993: Studia Anselmiana 110), pp.41-51 (Reprinted in LWSS, pp.137-147).

[3] See above, pp.8-9.

[4] *Peregrinatio Egeriae* 46:1-4.

[5] See J. Mateos (ed.), *Le Typicon de la Grand Église*, II (Rome, 1963: OCA 166), pp.38-39.

[6] I do not find convincing the recent argument of C. Renoux (in 'La quarantine pré-paschale au 3e siècle à Jérusalem', *La Maison-Dieu* 196 [1993/4], pp.111-129), who suggests that biblical references in homilies preached by Origen at Jerusalem in A.D. 240 or 241, presumably six weeks before Easter, demonstrate the existence of an organized forty-day pre-paschal Lent in the middle of the third century, an organization confirmed by similar references in the later Armenian and Georgian lectionaries. Since Renoux himself notes that this period was neither ascetical nor pre-baptismal in focus, the most that can be concluded is that Origen preached in Jerusalem at some point in the weeks before Easter in the middle of the third century on some of the biblical readings which later would become incorporated into the Lenten lectionary of that tradition.

I have suggested elsewhere[1] that outside of Egypt there was at most a three-week period of final preparation for baptism before Nicea. In those traditions expressing a clear preference for baptism at Pascha (Rome and North Africa) this three-week period functioned as a kind of primitive 'Lent'. But in those traditions without such a clear paschal preference (possibly Jerusalem, Armenia, North Italy, and Spain), this period was instead oriented either toward a different liturgical feast (e.g., Epiphany) or to no specified occasion whatsoever. What appears to have happened in the Nicene context then is a synthesis of differing baptismal traditions. Egypt contributed its indigenous tradition of the forty days, already assimilated to the forty-day (post-baptismal) fast of Jesus, which, together with both the baptismal preparation traditions elsewhere and the increasing preference for paschal baptism, became the universal Christian tradition of 'Lent'. In return, Egypt received its forty-day period back—though now re-formulated as a pre-paschal season—as well as a new focus on paschal rather than post-Epiphany baptism. That this was only partially successful in Egypt is shown both by the concern of Athanasius in his 'Festal Letter' of 330 and a letter to Sarapion of Thmuis in 340 that the Lenten fast was not being observed[2], and by the fact, as noted above, that to this day in the Coptic Orthodox Church baptism itself is not to be celebrated between Palm Sunday and Pentecost.

What we know of the liturgical year in the early Egyptian tradition may be minimal, indeed. Nevertheless, the little we do know, or can reasonably conjecture, is quite significant in relationship to the general development and theology of the liturgical year in both East and West. And, if nothing else, it appears to be the case that it is this tradition which, albeit in a rather round-about way, and in spite of its own intentions to the contrary, ultimately gave Lent itself to the Church as a whole.

---

[1] See M. E. Johnson, 'From Three Weeks to Forty Days: Baptismal Preparation and the Origins of Lent' in *Studia Liturgica* 20, 2 (1990), pp.185-200 (Reprinted in LWSS, pp.118-136).
[2] Talley, *Year*, pp.168-170, 217-218.